THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXV SEPTEMBER, 1937 No. 207

EDITORIAL

The Bishop of Chichester's Charge, *Common Order in Christ's Church*, is one of the important documents of the time. There are those who would be inclined to describe the Bishop of Chichester as merely a very competent man of affairs, who adds to his competence in domestic matters a peculiar interest and a peculiar knowledge in regard to Christian international relations. There are also, we believe, some who would credit him with occasionally being content to seek the reconciling formula rather than the complete treatment of the problem. Readers of the Charge will find their estimate of competence confirmed by a document which is well-informed, shrewd, penetrating, lucid. It is long, but there is in it not an unnecessary sentence. The second impression referred to, that of sympathetic acquaintance with continental affairs, though it is a very just one, is not particularly affected by this Charge. The third impression, that of a somewhat superficial opportunism, wherever it has been entertained, may now be definitely laid aside. The Charge is a truly Christian, fatherly utterance, breathing a pastoral spirit and using the method of persuasive appeal alike to the best instincts and to the most sober reason of the clergy of the diocese of Chichester and of all Christendom.

Many of the things that it contains are the things that all episcopal Charges must contain—remarks about numbers, pastoral care, experiments in hours of services, day schools, Sunday schools, other teaching agencies—all wisely put. The central contribution made to the healing of the disorderly ecclesiastical situation in which we find ourselves is his way of treating the use of the Order of Holy Communion. The answers to the Bishop's Visitation questions disclosed the fact that of 400 parishes "the great majority" use the 1662 service, with "no material departure from that form"—*i.e.*, apart

from the omission of the Long Exhortation. The other parishes fall into groups—a group which omits portions of the service, a Romanizing group, a 1549 group, an Interim Rite group, a Scottish-liturgical-type group, a 1928 group. Some of the variations implied in these designations the Bishop expresses a personal willingness to approve. Thus, of the custom of using the Prayer of Oblation with the Lord's Prayer immediately after the Prayer of Consecration, he writes: "Which I should myself most willingly sanction if I were free to do so . . . has very good Anglican history . . . at one stage of the revision of the Prayer Book provisionally approved by Canterbury Convocation . . . exceptionally strong case . . . in the eyes of many very desirable on liturgical grounds . . . my great disappointment."

Is there then no hope of enrichment? This question is answered as follows: Worship is the action of the whole Church. A Catholic Christian is happy to feel that the worship which is going forward in his Church is that which the whole Church does and wishes to see done. This is not wholly possible because of the divided state of Christendom. But it is possible to have the Catholic spirit in the matter. We are not Congregationalists. We do not believe that the local congregation is the essential, self-sufficing unit. The unit in Church tradition is the diocese, and the diocese is, constitutionally and historically, part of the Catholic Church. There is for us a certain prescribed method. To depart from that, except by authority, is Congregationalism, or possibly an individualism which is not even liked by the congregation. It is lawful to press for changes in the law, but it is not lawful to make changes without authority. The Bishop himself speaks continually as one under authority. One striking passage is: "I have a duty as your Ordinary; and in fulfilment of my own consecration vows, and the charge which is laid upon me. I am not expressing personal opinions, or preferences, but rather expounding, as I believe, the declared principles of the Church of England. I am not a private Bishop."

The most serious departure from the 1662 order is that of the Romanizing section. Most serious, not because it is necessarily worse than any other, but that it is apparently the deliberate adoption of the order of another Church with which we are, unhappily, not in communion. If there is one thing certain about the English Church, it is that it is neither

Roman nor Congregationalist. All clergymen have repeatedly, at times of licence, institution, etc., solemnly accepted the English Church order, and have undertaken to observe it. Accordingly, the Bishop, subject to one reservation hereafter to be indicated, is " bound as the Ordinary to ' order ' the use of the Holy Communion Service of the Book of Common Prayer in all parish churches of the diocese." He is further bound to require that the service shall be said audibly, and that private devotions must not be such as to interfere with the conduct of the Rite.

The only variations which a Bishop is entitled to authorize are those contained in the 1928 Book. The Bishop acknowledges that " in being ready to permit the alternative order of 1928 he is offering an order which for various reasons has not hitherto been received with particular favour." For ourselves, we cannot help observing that the disfavour often seems to arise from a prejudice which has somehow been created, and that the Book is often waved aside by those who do not know what it contains. However, the Bishop sets forth very clearly the amount of synodical and constitutional authority which it can really be said to possess, and reminds his hearers that in 1929 the two Upper Houses of Convocation, with the " loyal support " of the Lower Houses, resolved that in the exercise of his discretion " each Bishop will be guided by the proposals set forth in the Book of 1928." Beyond this no Bishop has the power to go. The Bishop of Chichester in 1936 consulted the Archbishop of the Province about the limits of his authority under the Convocation resolutions of 1929. The Archbishop, having taken legal advice, replied that the resolutions must not be regarded as contemplating any permissible deviations except those of 1928.

So there it is. And what really can be said against it ? If the Church of England were in reality a part of the Roman Church, it would be quite simple. If the Church of England were Congregational, it would be quite simple. But in fact the Church of England is neither of these things. And the strength of the Bishop's Charge is that he appeals to the Church. He makes no secret of the fact that he would like, for his own part, to meet the wishes of many of his brethren, he knows perfectly well how much is owed to Anglo-Catholics in the Church of England, and how foolishly Bishops have often acted in time past. But he believes in the Church, and

he proposes both to practise and to enjoin obedience to the Church. He has hopes that the projected Round Table Conference will reach agreement, and that a series of variations, which need not be those of 1928, may be canonically authorized, but at present this has not been done. He ends with a telling quotation from Dr. N. P. Williams: "The Catholic priest, at least if he has any tincture of the true Catholic and priestly spirit, would rather say the most jejune and ill-arranged rite, which was that imposed upon him by authority, than the most splendid Liturgy devised by himself—just as the English gentleman would rather bear a plain coat-of-arms which was that of his family, and recognized as such by the proper heraldic authority, than any number of resplendent quarterings of his own invention." The Bishop finds it "difficult to conceive the circumstances in which I myself could ever contemplate using the procedure of the Ecclesiastical Courts for enforcing obedience. In spiritual matters the proper methods are, as it seems to me, those of instruction and admonition, and, if need be, reproach, with always a hope for repentance. But I do not want to have occasion for reproach." To this, the only response that seems possible is *τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσωμεν ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν; μὴ γένοιτο.*

The Oxford Conference was for those who took part in it a great experience, and in itself, within the limits imposed by inexorable fact, a great success. The limitations were of two kinds. (i.) The absence of Roman Catholic delegates was, so to speak, an antecedent necessity. Co-operation in devotional gatherings with other Churches is not compatible with their tradition, and even if they were to join in conference their general outlook is ecclesiastically so totalitarian that their contribution would not be very readily assimilated. (ii.) The necessity of having all speeches and all documents in three languages makes genuine communication of ideas very difficult. The continentals seemed to be occasionally haunted by an uneasy suspicion that they were failing to defend some treasured point or to express some essential proviso. It was suggested by a polyglot Dutch professor that some sort of œcumenical theological vocabulary ought to be compiled, so that technical terms could always be used in agreed senses. Some at least of the uneasiness felt by Swiss and French Barthians in any discussion about the place to be assigned to reason in theology might by this means be mitigated. Logos, Reason, Sophia, Pensée are all difficult terms, and when they are misunderstood in discussion the results may be quite serious.

A third limitation, so far as the Orthodox and Anglican delegates were concerned, arose out of the membership of the Conference. Anglican delegates from the Home Church were only eighteen in number, though there were other Anglicans from U.S.A. and the Dominions and the Younger Churches. The general level was Lutheran—or less. There was nothing contrary to Catholic order in the daily devotions, which were meditations, admirably conducted in the three languages in turn, but they were non-liturgical, and certain Orthodox and Anglican delegates pressed for some provision at the next such conference of liturgical worship according to the tradition and discipline of the Orthodox, Anglican, Swedish, Old Catholic or other Church.

The most encouraging thing about the Conference was its resolute insistence on the idea of the Church. Many of the delegates, as one American said, had come to Oxford talking about the Churches, but all left talking about the Church. This was mainly because those who organized the Conference, notably Dr. J. H. Oldham, were resolved that they should do so. Some delegates had at times the misgivings that they had simply been called together to register agreement with Dr. Oldham's convictions. Very good convictions, and expressed with a gentle pertinacity that touched both mind and conscience, but not really formulated *de novo* by the Conference. Yet, does it matter? It is a thing of such extraordinary importance to have a mixed body of non-Roman Christians all talking of the Body of Christ, and *Una Sancta*, that no one need mind how they learned it. They were all sure that the Church, like the Gospel, is "given." The ancient heresy that there was a time once when a number of scattered Christians suddenly thought it would be a good plan to have a Church, and so they had one, is quite dead.

Another notable mark of the Conference was its reaffirmation of the fact that the Gospel, while it claims at all times to be judged by its harmony with truth, is compelled by the necessity of its belief in the Incarnation to have a definite impact on life. The Conference met to consider the bearing of Christianity on *Church, Community and State.* This means politics, economics and international relationships. The Press was a little hard. The speech of the one delegate who appeared to be in opposition was often reported, and *The Times*, in the old way from which we thought *The Times* had emerged, suggested that the Conference identified the teaching of our

Lord with a nebulous Socialism. Mr. John Maud, the young Anglican layman who was Chairman of the Economic Section, stoutly contended (*The Times*, August 7) that the Conference had not identified Christianity with either a nebulous Socialism or a nebulous Conservatism. They had been occupied, as readers of the reports, when they are published, will perceive, with an attempt to ascertain the verdict of the Christian judgment on contemporary facts and to diagnose the duty of Christian citizens. There was in the reports more of the element of public confession of sin than the public is at all likely to understand, but when they were making positive affirmations about the thing which Christianity has to give to the world, they were bold. "Tell it out among the heathen that the Lord is King."

Two books to be read. One is theology of the profoundest sort, Father Boulgakov's *The Wisdom of God* (Williams and Norgate. 6s.). We hear complaints sometimes that books purporting to be theological contain only a dressed-up humanism, and have no gospel in them. This is real theological thinking, and yet it embodies a resolute and very successful attempt to relate the divine with the world in which we live. Redemption is the relation between the uncreated and created Wisdom. Thus, as Frank Gavin says in his Preface, "God, who is the God of all, is the God of Plato and Aristotle as well as of St. Paul and St. John." A book to be read more than once. The other volume contains twelve short chapters on *The Patience of God*, by A. H. Thompson, Archdeacon of Exeter (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). They are not sermons. They are a quiet, scholarly reminder of the eternal things, and the book will help to enlighten and confirm many who are distracted and bewildered by the pace of life and their own spiritual infirmities.

IN MEMORIAM

CANON SIR EDWYN HOSKYNS, 1884-1937

It is at least arguable that, for my generation—that is, for the generation that began to take an interest in public affairs about 1911, or after*—the two outstanding names in the history of Christian thought in England in the present century are those of G. K. Chesterton and Sir Edwyn Hoskyns. Posterity may qualify that verdict: it is too early to attempt a final judgment. But what posterity is bound to recognize is that both alike were men by whom God wrought great deliverance: and it is for that deliverance that we who have entered into their labours owe to their memory an incalculable debt.

Their respective tasks differed as widely as their methods. It was given to Chesterton, more than to any other single individual, to change the intellectual climate of his age. He belonged, as he himself remarks in his *Autobiography*, to the generation that was educated by agnostics: and he became the ringleader in what was in truth something between a mutiny and a war of liberation, and yet which never seemed quite to lose the spirit of an undergraduate rag. That was indeed the secret both of its strength and of its weakness. The one limitation of Chesterton's apologetic was that, despite its brilliant fencing and its intellectual exuberance, it lacked the foundation of a solid and well-knit theology. Yet he was able to demonstrate with a wealth of paradox and with an enormous sense of fun that if anything was stuffy and pedantic and intellectually obsolete and obscurantist and second-rate, it was not the Christian Religion, but the things that claimed to be intellectually and morally superior to Christianity. His bowling was so unconventional, according to the decorous standards of the devout agnostic, that conventional agnosticism, the ethical rationalism of that age of refined but muddled thinking, was quite unable to stand up to it. The result is that at the present time the Christian side is in, and has in fact been batting for a considerable period. For it is thanks to the lobs and yorkers and full-pitchers of Chestertonian apologetic that it is intellectually respectable today to call yourself a Christian—indeed, it is hardly intellectually respectable not to do so: which was not the case thirty years ago.

The particular tyranny of superstition from which it was

* And therefore just missed the impact of Tyrrell, Von Hügel, Schweitzer, to mention no others.

given to Hoskyns to deliver us was not the tyranny of ethical rationalism, but rather the tyranny of that Liberal Humanitarianism in which old-fashioned agnosticism had naturally tended to take refuge. His essay on *The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels* in *Essays Catholic and Critical* (1926), which carried his fame far beyond the limits of the Cambridge Divinity School, may be said to have marked the turning of the tide in the study of New Testament theology in England. In that epoch-making essay, Hoskyns demonstrated overwhelmingly that "the Jesus of History" was not the Jesus of history at all. Let it be said at once that no estimate of its significance would be fair or just that omitted to mention the influence of Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede** which lay behind it. Yet Hoskyns' essay assured, if it did not initiate, the victory of a constructive Liberal Catholicism over the popularized Liberal Protestant interpretation of the Gospels. It is easy now to forget the importance of that essay at the moment of its publication: but if its value after the passage of a decade is not more widely appreciated at the present time, that is in itself a silent tribute to its effectiveness in 1926.

Hoskyns had studied under Harnack at Berlin: he was a friend of Schweitzer: at a later period he had the honour of lecturing before the University of Tübingen: and it may be said of him that no man has done more to familiarize the Church of England with the vitally important developments in Biblical theology in Germany since the War. When Barth broke like a bombshell over the sleeping tents of Anglicanism, only those who had attended Hoskyns' lectures in the old lecture-room at Corpus found little of novelty either in the idiom or in the theme. His translation of Barth's *Commentary on Romans* (1933), apart from being a notable linguistic feat, is an historic landmark. His own reputation as a New Testament theologian stood even higher in Germany than it did at home, and he had the privilege of being connected with other scholars of international distinction in the preparation of Professor Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch*. His essay on "Jesus the Messiah" in *Mysterium Christi* (1930), a composite work arising out of the Canterbury and Eisenach (Wartburg) Conferences, and one to which German and English theologians contributed, enhanced his status in both countries. In 1931 he published, in collaboration with the Rev. F. N. Davey, a former pupil, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, a work of profound and incisive scholarship and of wide popular appeal, which has just been reissued in a revised and cheaper edition.

* Translated (1910) as *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.*

This is perhaps the place to mention one or two of his more scattered pieces. A little pamphlet, *Christ and Catholicism* (The Congress Books, No. 12: Society of SS. Peter and Paul, 1923), is still of interest as containing in germ much of his later thought: its immediate purpose was "to point out that the characteristic notes of Catholic Christianity can be traced back to the teaching of our Lord Himself, and that, therefore, His Gospel was not so 'simple' as is often supposed." Its opening paragraph reads curiously today, and again we can measure by that sense of strangeness the significance of Hoskyns' achievement in the field of New Testament theology.

"At the present time it is widely assumed that the Christianity of the New Testament and the Catholic faith are two different systems, and that the religion taught by our Lord bears no vital relation to the Catholic religion, which claims His authority. It is said that He taught a simple religion of the love of God and the love of man. . . . After His death His disciples, and St. Paul in particular, are said gradually to have deified Him, invented the Church with its doctrines and sacraments and its emphasis on the miraculous, and elaborated (and, in so doing, corrupted) the simplicity of His teaching. The outcome of this development was the Catholic religion, which dominated Western civilization till the Reformation, when Luther rediscovered something of the original religion, it being left for the scholars of the nineteenth century to complete his discovery. Now at last, it is claimed, the true Jesus of history has been found, and we are free of dogmas, free of the miraculous 'supernatural' additions to genuine Christianity, free of sacramental and sacrificial worship, free of the Church."

Admittedly, the superstitions which he was there denouncing do still to some extent persist: and, though long since banished from the lecture room, the curious notion that our Lord's teaching was "simple" and "merely moral," and that the Church is a luxury for those who feel attracted by it rather than a necessity for all faithful Christian men and women, is still kept alive, for instance, by the periodical religious articles in the newspapers. Nevertheless, no competent authority today would write that paragraph precisely in those terms.

Christ and Catholicism, as will have been observed, had something of the character of a "Party" manifesto. But, although he was a staunch Anglo-Catholic, Hoskyns was never in any danger of becoming in any narrow sense a "Party" man, or of making what Bishop Creighton, with unerring judgment, regarded as the supreme mistake of Laud's career—the mistake of fighting for great principles on small issues.* He was not, indeed, insensitive to the exigencies of the party conflict, and certain phrases in the paper which he read at the Anglo-

* "The Failure of Laud," in *The Mind of St. Peter, and Other Sermons* (1904), p. 98.

Catholic Congress of 1930 on " The Apostolicity of the Church," although the validity of the statements which they embodied is wholly independent of petty considerations of time and place, had, and were recognized as having, a direct bearing upon a particular concrete situation.

" And now the Bishops. . . .

" In our modern controversies we Catholics are not concerned primarily with a question of organization. We are concerned with the nature of the Gospel, at a time when there is much vague talk about the independent motions of the Holy Spirit. Taught by the New Testament, we are bound to think of the Episcopate as preserving the witness of the Apostles, and to demand this of the Bishops. The Bishops are not mystical persons to whom we owe some strange kind of undefined mysterious obedience. The Bishops are responsible to bear witness to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and to hold the Church to that witness. Nor does the Episcopate offer an opportunity to gifted individuals to occupy an exalted position and to tyrannize over those who are endowed to a lesser degree with intellectual or other gifts. The authority of the Bishops depends solely on their link with the Apostles, though we may hope that this link may be productive of virtue and courage and of intellectual and spiritual insight. Such resultant powers are, however, wholly secondary. Nor (and I would like to emphasize this in an assembly of Catholics) do the Bishops represent the whole history of the Church and bring the whole weight of this history crashing down upon our shoulders. There is much in the history of the Church which we should do well to forget or be entirely ignorant of. The Bishops represent the history of the Church only in so far as that history has been controlled by the will of God perfected in Jesus Christ. In this sense they link the past with the creative work of God in the present and in the future."*

But he was never interested in the party conflict for its own sake. " We are concerned with the nature of the Gospel ": and in his later work he tended more and more to leave the " Catholic " question to take care of itself, and to concentrate upon the fundamental issue of the character of our Lord's teaching as it is displayed to us in the New Testament. The *Riddle of the New Testament* is the fruit of this intellectual self-discipline.

" . . . When the Catholic Christian kneels at the words *incarnatus est* or at the words *and was incarnate*, he marks with proper solemnity his recognition that the Christian Religion has its origin neither in general religious experience, nor in some peculiar esoteric mysticism, nor in a dogma, and he declares his faith to rest upon a particular event in history. Nor is the Catholic Christian peculiar in this concentration of faith. This is Christian Orthodoxy, both Catholic and Protestant. In consequence, the Christian Religion is not merely open to historical investigation, but demands it, and its piety depends upon it. Inadequate or false reconstruction of the history of Jesus of Nazareth cuts at the heart of

* *Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress*, 1930, pp. 88, 90.

Christianity. The critical and historical study of the New Testament is therefore the prime activity of the Church. . . ."*

As to the particular problem implicit in the title of his earlier pamphlet, *Christ and Catholicism*, which was, as it were, the taking-off point for his later work, it is sufficient to quote the opening sentence of his essay on *The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels* as indicating his mature conviction: "For the Catholic Christian '*Quid vobis videtur de Ecclesia, What think ye of the Church?*' is not merely as pertinent a question as '*Quid vobis videtur de Christo, What think ye of the Christ?*': it is but the same question differently formulated."† The significance of this assertion lay in the fact that it cut right across the traditional conflict between Liberal Protestantism (Harnack) and Catholic Modernism (Loisy): and as that particular debate receded more and more into the background, Hoskyns, standing, as he did, in the very centre of the New Testament field, found himself preoccupied with the question as formulated in the latter rather than in the former of these two modes.

As his fame grew, the demands upon his time and energy became more exacting. (Latterly he used sometimes to question the legitimacy of those demands so lightly and even recklessly made upon the clergy, which take them careering gratuitously about the country away from their work, their parishes, even their dioceses, and often, inevitably, to the detriment of the jobs that they are being paid to do.) Everywhere he was in demand as a lecturer and as a preacher. In the latter capacity, despite the perfect clarity of his exposition, those who were unfamiliar with the premisses, the idiom, and the natural movement of his thought, were liable to feel themselves rather beyond their depth: I doubt whether the normal undergraduate (not a theologian) during his first three academic years could really appreciate or understand what Hoskyns was driving at, but in the fourth year, if a man stayed up for it, his sermons in the College Chapel suddenly became luminous and arresting: and I remember equally a course of lectures which he gave at Sion College in 1934 by which most of the older clergy, although impressed, seemed to be somewhat puzzled or bewildered, whereas the effect upon the younger men, of whom many had sat under him as undergraduates, was indeed electrifying.

But the centre of his influence lay in Cambridge: and for the past fifteen years it was true of him, to a greater degree than of any of his colleagues or seniors in the Faculty of Divinity, that young ordinands gravitated to this University for the

* *The Riddle of the New Testament* (1931), p. 10.
† *Essays Catholic and Critical* (1926), p. 153.

express purpose of studying theology under his direction. It is no dishonour to the Divinity Professors to recall how men and women came to Cambridge for the sake of Hoskyns. His lectures on the Theology and Ethics of the New Testament were exceptionally vivid, forceful, trenchant, and unexpected, and were delivered with a sustained enthusiasm and excitement which it is impossible for anyone who heard them ever to forget: by contrast, his sermons, though equally emphatic, seemed curiously restrained. It was through these lectures, and through his College teaching and his supervisions, that he left his abiding mark upon the Church of England: for through them he exerted an unrivalled influence upon the intellectual formation of the younger clergy, who remain to carry on the work from which God in His inscrutable wisdom has now recalled him.

With Hoskyns, New Testament theology in the Church of England, which for the earlier part of the century had been for the most part trivial and confused, and lacking in purpose and direction, became once more dynamic and creative. That was the secret of his influence and of his significance in the history of Anglicanism in the twentieth century. It may be doubted whether he would ever have come to interest himself in the wider, if more nebulous, problems of philosophical theology, for he was essentially a New Testament scholar, and his great achievement consisted in re-anchoring Anglican theology to the Scriptures. It was upon the problems of New Testament exegesis that he concentrated his intellectual powers as a theologian: and you may generally recognize a pupil of Hoskyns by the fact that, when he says "theology," what he means is "New Testament theology."

But Hoskyns' influence was in no sense purely academic. As the restorer of New Testament theology in England, he was also the restorer of Biblical preaching (as contrasted with that habit of moralizing from the pulpit which is the accursed heritage of the eighteenth century) in the normal pastoral ministry of the Church. And if his interests in his own subject were markedly limited to his own particular field, it would be far from true to suggest that his interests were ever limited to his own subject. He had a far deeper understanding of the Problem of History than most professional historians, largely, I think, as the result of his unfinished work on the Fourth Gospel: and his discovery of the significance and intention of Archbishop Parker's collection of manuscripts in the Corpus Library, of which he was Librarian, was a notable contribution to our appreciation of the Elizabethan Settlement. Unfortunately he could never be prevailed upon to publish his findings

in any field in which he regarded himself only as an amateur. Yet he had an extraordinary genius, not confined to his professional studies as a theologian, for recognizing and concentrating upon the real issues. Vitality and realism were the outstanding qualities of his thought: he had no patience for those who attempted to evade or soften what he called "the roughness of the Biblical material," or to refine it into "a delicate spiritual piety": and I remember him once observing in private conversation that it was almost to be regretted that we could not sacrifice a bull once a year, preferably on a hot day in summer, in order to enable theological students to understand the meaning of the word "sacrifice" in the Old Testament. He was a brilliant and an enthusiastic conversationalist, and his views on topics as divergent—though he would never have allowed that epithet—as the Theory of Cricket (he was a devotee of Lord's) and the Teaching of Scripture in Secondary Schools (he was a member of the Hadow Committee on Education) were always incisive and illuminating. His grasp of the latter of these problems was indeed remarkable, and it is vitally important that the conclusions at which he had arrived should not be disregarded now that they have lost the benefit of his reasoned but impassioned advocacy.

Hoskyns was one of the greatest teachers in the annals of his University, and it is certain that his influence upon the mind and life of the Church of England has not been terminated, much less obliterated, by his death. It is indeed a tragedy that the measure of that influence and the quality of his scholarship should be so inadequately represented by the tale of his published writings. Yet the really striking thing is how much of his work had been brought to the point at which others can and will carry it on. And that is perhaps the highest praise that can be given to any teacher, particularly to one who dies, like Hoskyns, suddenly and unexpectedly.

Requiescat in pace.

CHARLES SMYTH.

THE BIBLE THE INTERPRETER OF HUMAN HISTORY*

HISTORY is compelling us to attend to its significance. That seems to me to be one of the most obvious of facts in the world of learning. We should not have done so, at any rate so soon, if history were not by way of making itself so unpleasant.

* A paper read at the Annual Conference of the Anglican Fellowship, July, 1937.

For it is a largely unaccountable affair, and is never as docile to the handling as the sciences termed natural. Therefore, while it is keeping comparatively quiet there is much to be said for letting sleeping dogs lie. But when it cries havoc and lets loose the dogs of war, when it speaks of red ruin and the breaking up of laws, then its problem can be no more ignored by the savant in his study than its pressure by the man in the street. Here, in history, there may well appear to be witness enough to the truth of doctrines preached by two men of eminence in the early days of Greek philosophy, Heraclitus of Ephesus and Empedocles of Agrigentum. For where more than in history is a particular demonstration given of that adage which the former held to be relevant for all life, that " war is of all things father and king " ? And where again does the latter's principle of discord make so powerfully for separation ? And if it be replied that the power of discord is destined to be shattered, since that other principle to which Empedocles gave the name of Love will one day triumph and restore unity, the student will not build too much on this since he knows that this philosopher dreamed of no final victory of love, but only of a merging of all individual things into the undifferentiated mixture which was their original condition, to be followed by further periods of separation and union in unending succession, while the man in the street will be sceptical of all promises, even of so limited a one as this of our old Greek friend, which are made on the basis of a supposed law governing the course of history. As a matter of fact, the philosophy of Heraclitus and of Empedocles was, for what it was worth, not a philosophy of history, but a philosophy of physics.

Undoubtedly one of the great differences between the thinking of the ancient and of the modern world is that Heraclitus and Empedocles were, in their several ways, the philosophers of evolution. But their evolutionary doctrine did not depend upon any notion of biological development. They had no philosophy of the organism, let alone of organisms in relation to one another. Their conception of existence as an unending series of periods in alternating rhythm of outflow and return needed no modification from the recognition of a mass of facts that call for a biological, as contrasted with a merely physical, interpretation of the world and of man's life within it. But quite otherwise was it with those nineteenth-century men of science who taught and wrote under the influence of Darwin's discoveries and of the science of evolution when that was taken to embody a satisfactory, and, indeed, all-conquering metaphysic. It was this that accounts for the optimistic idea of progress, so prevalent in the last decades of the last century

and continuing up to the outbreak of the Great War. What Berdyaev speaks of and criticizes as the idea of progress in a straight line is certainly to be connected with the triumphant results of scientific investigation. Those results both enhanced the glory of man and suggested that through the operation of laws of development upwards man would attain, and not slowly, to an excellence of power, rooted in knowledge and bearing fruit in happiness, such as he had never yet imagined. Auguste Comte and the Philosophy of Positivism is as typical in his outlook upon the future as is Herbert Spencer in his interpretation of the laws that have led through the past to the present.

So far, it might seem, so good. But there are always awkward questions to be asked, if the sort of man turns up who can ask them. (This fact of the turning up of the awkward questioner is, by the way, one of the facts that deserves to be pondered by people who are most at home when they have least to do with those tiresome things that we call persons.) And the awkward question in this business of progress was the question "Whose?" In different ways it was asked by Nietzsche and by Marx. Each of them was profoundly dissatisfied with the satisfaction that many of their contemporaries displayed as they expounded the good news of evolution. Each felt that there was no cause for all this self-congratulation on the part of a humanity that was embodying or expressing no higher ideal than that approved of by the far from admirable bourgeoisie. Each proclaimed the need and the hope, almost the certainty, of a new epoch no longer dominated by the standards of the comfortable middle classes. So Nietzsche preached the Superman and Marx the Proletariat, whose only bond of union, as far as one can see, would consist in their determination to liquidate the contemptible bourgeoisie.

It is obvious that the criticism to which the notion and ideal of progress in its nineteenth-century liberal form was subjected had both a metaphysical and an ethical character. It meant both a different interpretation and a different moral evaluation of life and history. Some of the great Victorian scientists were what we should call materialists in their outlook upon, and explanation of, the universe, but the ideal of progress was by no means the result of a materialism that denied the reality of spiritual forces, and, in particular, of freedom. Huxley thought, quite wrongly I am sure, that he would have accepted a firm offer to turn him into a kind of clock, but he did not for a moment imagine that he was one. And Huxley's belief in man's ethical duty to challenge in the sphere of human life the working of the laws that controlled the processes of nature

received famous expression in his Romanes lecture. Neither Nietzsche nor Marx talked this language. Their thoughts and their desires belonged to the revolutionary, not to the reformist, order. They called for a new interpretation of the world and for a new order of human life within the world; they paid no tribute to a morality which, in their judgment, had no more abiding validity than any other of the features of order of social life. So far as Marx is concerned, I presume that he would not have disowned words spoken by Lenin in 1920: "We say that our morality is wholly subordinated to the interests of the class-struggle of the proletariat. We deduce our morality from the facts and needs of the class-struggle of the proletariat": the existing structure of society.

Whatever and how many criticisms there are to be made of Nietzsche and Marx, at least it cannot be said that they ignored history. Those who accept neither of them as a reliable guide will admit that they tried to look more deeply into things than did many of those who were held in much repute as philosophers and prophets. Their disturbing notions took time to work within history, but the time has come. That Nietzsche would recognize in Nazi and Fascist ideals and their embodiment in national civilizations and cultures the dawn of the era into which shall stride the Superman is not at all certain; still less, I would suggest, that the Superman himself had appeared in Hitler and Mussolini. Yet some of the more unpleasant traits of the Superman and of what he will bring seem to be foreshadowed in the dictators and in the social orders for which they are responsible. On the other side there can be no doubt. What Marx taught came violently to life in Russian Communism, and the attempt has been made, and successfully made, with whatever reservations and compromises to meet occasional needs, to direct the historical movement in one of those great streams of national life which compose its onward flow into channels dug in accordance with the prescribed interpretation of history. It is this event more than anything else which is responsible for that conscious attention to the whole problem of history to which I pointed at the beginning of this paper.

No judgment as to the direction in which the movement of history is going or should go is of any real value apart from an interpretation of history as a whole. It is, of course, possible to interpret history in a negative way by ignoring it. The philosophy of history then becomes the devaluation of history. That tendency seems to me to be very definitely present in Hindu religion and in much of Greek philosophy. For the Hindu thinker history belongs to the realm of Maya,

illusion. Its material environment is the witness to its unreality. The great thing to do, if one has the will and endurance to accomplish it, is to contract out of the dream-world of history by a spiritual isolation, of which the instruments are asceticism and meditation. Primitive Buddhism had much the same character in respect of its attitude to that stream of life which is immanent in the historical order. In his account of Buddhism in *The Philosophy of the Good Life*, Dr. Gore laid stress upon that which lies at the centre of the Buddha's doctrine—namely, that "it is assumed that misery is inseparable from life, or, in other words, that life is an evil to be got rid of if possible." In the eighth section of the "Noble Eightfold Path" the Buddha insisted upon "regular and protracted meditation on all that sustains *disgust* with life." Clearly from this point of view the only direction that anyone should try to give to history is direction towards its extinction; and whatever be the true interpretation of Nirvana, it is not in any sense the climax of the historical process, the event in which the final meaning of that process is revealed, but just the reverse. It is the victory over the process, the condemnation of the process, the revelation of its meaninglessness and of its intrinsically evil nature.

The ethic proper to the Hindu or Buddhistic interpretation of history is alien to the Greek mind, which was neither world-condemning nor world-renouncing. Yet it cannot be said that the Greek philosophers contributed much to a philosophy of history. There is, indeed, more of that in the great poets Æschylus and Sophocles, and in the great historians Herodotus and Thucydides. They were conscious of the operation of moral laws within human life, and the other three, if not Thucydides, connected that with the nature of the universe through their belief in God or the gods. But the philosophers do not appear to have looked hard at history and asked questions about it. Plato, I suppose, came nearest to that, but his great political treatises, *The Republic* and *The Laws*, give us designs for the sort of life that men ought to live together, and not a comprehensive survey of the meaning of human history. And his theory of ideas, while it reviews the relation between the transcendental and eternal realities and the various existences which belong to this lower world, does not ascribe to the whole movement of man's historical life any special significance. We come much nearer to a serious attempt to appreciate the course of history and to think of it as the scene of moral decisions which have eternal consequences in the religion of Zoroaster. For him the dualism that is rooted in the conflict between Ahura Mazdah and Ahriman establishes

the true character of human life as an opportunity for choice between good and evil. He looks forward to a real victory of the good in the world to come. He has no such idea as that of Heraclitus, afterwards adopted by the Stoics, of the periodical return of all things to that original condition out of which they emerged. The Stoics were teachers of a noble morality, and their lives were often a splendid testimony to their creed. But their view of the world takes the sense out of history, since that which happens again and again loses its moral content. Human life becomes a succession of innumerable stage armies running on and off the boards to no good purpose. Now if history were indeed only a stage play, that would still give us an account, even a philosophy, of its nature. After all, there must be some account of it in which the truth is expressed. But it will make all the difference according as one thinks of history as something that happens to have been thrown up in the course of nature's unconscious experimentations, or whether one sees in history an inner court of life where life's secret is more surely to be learnt than in the wide spaces of nature's developments. And as to the interpretation of history, the student may well start with a recognition of the necessity that a full philosophy of history should include, as Troeltsch has said, a consideration of the " problem regarding the relation of the historical process in the world to the fundamental forces of the universe." But here at once the difficulty confronts us that the relation may be at least partially unknowable until the results of the process are before us: and that is probably a long way ahead. The meaning of history cannot be demonstrated in advance of the revelation through the actual event of the meaning. And as to the demonstration it may be noted that it is only on an optimistic, I should prefer to say, a believing estimate of history that such a demonstration can be given. The pessimistic interpretation is that which finds expression once for all in Macbeth's words: " A tale of sound and fury signifying nothing." And if that be so, history with its actors is destined to lose itself in the barren sands of a universe in which all power of looking either backwards or forwards has vanished. If the pessimistic humanists are right that will be the end.

The question as to history's meaning is, therefore, the question as to history's end. Everything comes to an issue in eschatology, and only there. Convinced as I am of this, I should feel bound to dissent in part from the judgment passed by the Dean of St. Paul's in his book *The Purpose of God*. In it he writes: " If we attach any ultimate significance to history, in the end we shall have to choose between some form of the

doctrine of recurrence and some form of eschatology." I entirely agree with him that the end of history cannot be conceived as an historical event, a view similar to that of Berdyaev that " the solution of the destiny of universal history involves the definitive conquest of time's corruptible nature. No doctrine of time admits of any such hope or purpose either as a fact or as a problem." But I cannot see that any doctrine of recurrence secures significance to history. The whole gist of recurrence is that there is no such thing as ultimacy, and therefore one looks in vain for ultimate significance.

The various divergent attitudes towards history which a study of religions and philosophies would shew are reflected in Christian thinking. And Christian thinking cannot be regarded in isolation from the concrete situations in which Christians have found themselves. The primitive Church lived in an eschatological atmosphere. It was convinced of the way in which earthly history would be brought to an end by the return of the Lord Jesus as the glorified Messiah. Its interest in the historical order was directed to the end: and yet not simply to the end; for while that tarried, Christians were not called upon to cut themselves loose from history as from an unclean thing. The faith in Christ as the u niversal Redeemer, as the One who had come to save the world even though and even after the world had rejected Him, made such an attitude impossible. The Church's Gospel, both of creation and of redemption, was a bulwark against the kind of world-denying spirituality which was to be promoted by some at least of the varieties of Gnosticism and by the Manichæan theology. The Church's mission involved both a challenge to the world and an appeal to the world. The Roman Empire was never regarded by the New Testament writers, with the possible exception of the author of the Apocalypse, as outside the providential dispensation of God. The Apologists did not treat the Emperors as beyond the reach of prayer and rational argument. That history as a whole might proceed on Christian inspiration, still more precisely that the Empire itself might be Christianized, we cannot assert as a hope that found an early entrance into the Church, though I am not sure that it never fired the imagination of St. Paul. But there was the Church making its impact upon the life of its time, manifesting a new ethic that was not generally interpreted as a call to Christians to abandon the activities of secular life. The world, and therefore history, with the Church in it could not be thought of as just the same as it would have been had there been no Church.

Nevertheless, it is during these first three centuries of our

era that the conception of Church History as something that can without absurdity be studied independently of World History is justifiable. With the conversion of Constantine and the coming of the Christian Empire that possibility ceases. Many hard things have been said about the results of Constantine's conversion. Some of them are true enough; but it is worth while remembering that the great change which then took place immensely strengthened the belief that the Church had a duty to the world in the common ways of life, and that life as a whole ought to be purified and uplifted by the leaven of Christian ethical practice. It is true that a separation between the religious and the secular life was often dangerously emphasized; yet so was the possibility of envisaging life as a unity, within which, at all its points, there were the duty and the blessing of obedience to the will of God and the commandments of Christ. It is one of the curiosities of great Christian literature that Augustine was writing what is, with the possible exception of the *De Trinitate*, his noblest and in some ways his most influential work, *De Civitate Dei*, just when the sharp contrast which he drew between the earthly and the heavenly commonwealths had passed away. Yet he himself did not a little to point the moral of that passing by his teaching that the millennium of the Apocalypse was to be seen in the present reign of Christ and His saints upon the earth. And so he prepared the way for the notion and the actuality of the mediæval Theocracy, with its close relations, though often with its violent oppositions, between the two institutions that each in its respective station was appointed to do the service of God in the world—the Church and the Empire.

It was a splendid theory. With the reasons why and the manner in which it failed to maintain a dominant hold upon practice—that is, to direct history in accordance with its principles—I cannot stop: to many of you the story is familiar. Suffice it to say that the relation of the Church to the world has ever since been an unsettled problem among Christians. There has been no *one* Christian view, and that means that there has been no *one* judgment upon history that has expressed the Christian mind. It would be common ground that history has a meaning, that its character should bear witness to the relevance of Christ and His Church to history, that in history the divine judgment and the divine mercy are present to the discernment of faith, and that the final interpretation of history is given not within history itself, but in that which follows upon history, though not produced by history—namely, the coming of the Kingdom of God.

Beyond this we certainly cannot go at the present time.

The Oxford Conference on "Church, Community, and State" may help towards a more agreed Christian outlook, though it is obvious that the absence of representatives of the Roman Catholic Church is a particularly serious loss in view of that Church's strong historical sense, so intimately bound up with its own relations with the secular power in various countries. I think that if we try to put a question which will focus our difficulties it would be something like this: "Is there a Christian programme into correspondence with which the Church should try to bring the movement of history?" One would find the most diverse replies to such a question. Dr. Brunner's paper at Oxford supplies a very definitely negative answer, and I have little doubt that in this matter there would be little difference of opinion between him and Karl Barth. At the other extreme we have Mr. Kenneth Ingram with his condemnation of a merely neutral attitude on the part of the Church, where the clash between the political Right and the political Left is concerned. He would have the Church "share wholeheartedly the ideas of the Left." Only thus can the Church escape divine condemnation in this Day of the Lord. A similar note, at least in its ominous warning, is to be heard in the writings of Canon Barry, though he is not as luminous a signpost as Mr. Ingram, who seems to me to point in one direction, with Isaiah's words as the appropriate inscription: "This is the way, walk ye in it." But there can be no doubt that Canon Barry thinks that we have come to an historical, which is also a religious, crisis. Thus he writes in his stimulating and provocative work *The Relevance of the Church*: "It is the decisive hour for Christianity. Everywhere in the world it has reached the point when it must go forward or perish. And, indeed, the supreme issue of the new age is the victory or defeat of Christianity. On this more than on anything else whatever hangs the future of human civilization. The Church cannot stand on the defensive. If in these ambiguous nineteen-thirties anything can be confidently predicted, it is that any faith or institution content to stand merely on the defensive is doomed, irrevocably and beyond hope." On which the only comment that I wish to make here is that much depends on what is meant by "the defensive."

It is a confused background that we have been considering. The knowledge of what to think about history has not come easily either to the Ancients or to the Moderns. Christians cannot claim that they alone have been able to walk in the sunlight while others have been in the mists. But this advantage they have or may have, that there is both guidance and check to their views in the Book which they all hold sacred.

And while different conceptions of the character of inspiration affect the opinions that may be formed as to the exact nature of the control which the Bible should exercise over Christian thinking, the fact of a Biblical interpretation, if such a thing exists, provides at least a standard of reference with which Christians can compare their own outlook and judge how far it does or does not harmonize with that of the Bible.

First, then, what the Bible gives is primarily an interpretation, not of human history, but of the ways of God. It is intensely concerned with history; the Biblical writers, with the possible exception of the author of Ecclesiastes, but certainly not of the author of the Book of Job, would have repudiated any attitude to history that was not one of deep seriousness. But they view history *ex parte Dei*. When my father called his book *The Divine Aspect of History* he chose a title which, for all its significance, would not have contented a Biblical writer. The Bible sees history as the story of God's dealings with men; history is apprehended in its wholeness, and again as the scene, in the first instance, of God's activity rather than of man's. It is this which accounts for some of the difficulties that meet us in the Bible. These arise in connexion with the anthropomorphisms, often startling enough in what is said of God, and with certain ethical features of the Biblical writings. These facts, which can present themselves as stumbling-blocks, are, together, the result of the uncompromising Biblical faith in God as the Subject who works within human history, not the Object into relation with whom history is somehow or other to be brought. The God of the Bible is not the *Deus ex machina* of the Greek drama. The optimism of the Bible rests not on God's occasional intervention, but on His perpetual providence. But just because it is so clear that for the Bible God's ways are not as man's ways, there is no small perplexity for us when we see how fearlessly the Bible shews God as continually present and active in the ways where men walk and making of man's history a drama of which the final truth is not that man confronts man nor that man confronts God, but that God confronts man. The historical initiative is God's, and because that is permanently so there is never a point where it is adequate to say: "Man is responsible and not God." That is pre-eminently true of that which is for the Bible the supreme point of historical crisis, the Cross of Christ.

This Biblical doctrine, which is no formal teaching but the underlying attitude apparent throughout the Bible as to the action of God upon and within history, finds no parallel outside the Bible. On the one hand, the real Divine is not to be looked for by leaving history behind, which is the result in any religion

or philosophy where the world is not valued as truly God's world. If the world is not to be referred to God as its Creator, the events which take place in the world will not have any significance as pointers towards God. In one way or another man will then be wise to treat the world as irrelevant to God's purposes and to man's communion with Him, and the highest type of piety will be the flight of the soul alone to the Alone. A thoroughgoing dualism is to be discerned in this theology. On the other hand, the Bible has nothing in common with the monism which involves the idea of God as coming to self-expression in, as indeed dependent for His existence upon, the world in its development. In philosophy of this kind the idea of God as acting upon the world disappears. He may be immanent in the historical process, which is conceived of as a perpetual incarnating of the divine, which I take to be the view of the Italian idealists, or He may be a level to which the whole world-process will attain, as in the teaching of S. A. Alexander; but He is not such an one as could with any sense be addressed in the language of the Collects with which we are familiar. That language derives from the Biblical conviction that God is indeed Other than man or than the course of nature or the process of history, but that as His independence of nature is seen in the fact that nature owes itself to Him, so His independence of history is seen in His free activity, which is both upon and within history. And because the prophets of Israel came, in whatever way, to think of God as not only the God of Israel, but the one God of heaven and earth, it was not only in the history of Israel that they saw the signs of His hand in history. "Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir ?" is the word of the Lord in Amos. And few passages in the Scriptures have more of an unexpected promise of good than that which we read at the end of the nineteenth chapter of Isaiah: "In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land: whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance." The notion of a "causality immanent in experience," which is Troeltsch's description of the modern explanation of history, would be satisfactory from the Biblical standpoint only if the immanent causality were referred to the will of God as its ultimate derivation. History as a self-going concern has no more place in the Biblical outlook than has nature as a self-going concern.

Secondly, history, because it is the scene of man's moral choices and decisions, is viewed in accordance with its ethical

character. The idea that man's individual life, but not his corporate life, is to be morally determined and morally judged is alien from the Bible. A nation that seeks to order its life as though God were not the Judge, as though national glory or prestige, or whatever form self-interest may take, were the goal of its activity, cannot escape the verdict of divine condemnation. That condemnation is specially severe where the knowledge of the true God should have been the inspiration of national righteousness. But the peoples which have no such knowledge are nevertheless not free from divine judgment. But the coming of judgment within history means no necessary approval of the instruments of judgment. Assyria was such an instrument upon Israel, and in the destruction that the Roman army was to accomplish upon Jerusalem the blindness and pride of its people was to suffer a punishment that was of divine decree. But where there is a faithful remnant there is always hope for the future. That is clearest in the prophetic assurances of the recovery of Judah from the Babylonish captivity, since even if it is true that the captivity of a nation was reversed in the return of a Church, the contrast nation-Church is one that may be true from the standpoint of modern scholarship, but was not apparent to those directly concerned. In the New Testament the relevance of the Christian Church for the continuing history of man in his complex national life was not, and could not be, immediately clear. But we can see that the vision of the Church which St. Paul expounded in the epistle to the Ephesians is one that cannot leave the whole constitution of earthly life unaffected. And it may be noted that it is in the writing which shews the most tremendous criticism and condemnation of the world-state that we read of the City that descends from God out of heaven that—

> By its light will the nations walk; and into it will the kings of earth bring their glories; they will bring to it the glories and treasures of the nations.

Since Christ the Son of God has come into the world and is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, since the Church is in the world to bring the world to the knowledge of the true God and of the life eternal, a merely pietistic view of the world and its history, surrendering both to the powers of evil, is irreconcilable with the Biblical outlook. Doubtless the Barthian doctrine of all human institutions, as partaking of that sinfulness from which nothing human is exempt, is to be acknowledged as true in its measure; but that should not mean that any least fragment of human life is cut off from the regenerative powers of the divine activity.

Finally, for the Bible the end of history is that which is

itself superhistorical—namely, the Kingdom of God. Eschatology is an essential part of the Gospel. That is as true for the theologian as it is for the New Testament scholar. The Bible is a literature of hope. The inclusion of that winged virtue among the three theological virtues is not only a reflexion of the famous sentence in the thirteenth of First Corinthians, but is a reminder of one of the continuous features of the Bible. It is a hope which as we pass along the Biblical route, from level to level within the Old Testament, then on to the New Testament and our Lord's teaching, and then to the apostolic confidence, becomes more and more luminous.

It is an other-worldly hope, and in it is included the thought of a judgment and of a salvation beyond the limits of this world. But just because it is the history of men and nations that comes to be judged, the whole of this world's life is an arena of real moral decisions, and there can be no question of this or that department of life being free from the law of God and from the obligation to shew, in accordance with the possibilities that are open to it, obedience to that law. I would refer you at this point to the chapter, "The Doctrine of Progress and the Goal of History," in Berdyaev's book of which I have already made use. To quote all that I should like would be impossible; but of the first importance is the way in which he describes the relation of the historical process to an end which cannot fall within the process itself. "History," he says, "is in truth the path to another world. It is in this sense that its content is religious. But the perfect state is impossible within history itself; it can only be realized outside its framework." But that does not mean that the historical process and the perfect state are to be conceived of as two quite separate entities standing in no true inner relation to one another. Far-reaching indeed in its implicit denial of any such thesis is Berdyaev's affirmation that "our function at every period, at every moment of our historical destiny, is to determine our relation to the problem of life and history in the terms and according to the criteria of eternity." And the reverse of what the Russian theologian denies is positively asserted by that no less eminent Anglican philosophical theologian the Archbishop of York. In his Gifford Lectures, *Nature, Man, and God*, Dr. Temple writes as follows: "The values found in the historical, and pre-eminently those found in that sphere by Christianity, are such as belong essentially to the eternal. If the eternal is indifferent to these, a cleavage of the totality of things is effected so complete as to make the world unintelligible." Of that conviction the Bible is the home and the inspiration.

J. K. Mozley.

THE INCOMPREHENSIBILITY OF MYSTICISM: AN ESSAY IN CRITICISM

The mystical apprehension is a spiritual quality apparently less common today than ever. Something in the evolution of life has tended to blunt and harden the spiritual capacity of men and women. Instead of the critical outlook on life, many people have a sceptical outlook. Afraid of finding that they have been deluded by superstition, they reject as false anything that seems extraordinary, whereas in olden days it would also have been feared though accepted as supernatural. The world has grown wary over attributing experiences and events to the Divine, because in the past such have often turned out to be primitive fears and fancies masquerading as revelations of and from the Hereafter. So there has been produced a sceptical rather than a critical point of view, and agnosticism has tended to displace faith, and agnosticism is a tacit admission that on certain matters judgment is impossible.

Nevertheless the fact of a common humanity remains. Man is man, and when one man asserts that he has experienced something spiritual which is totally foreign to another man, then the latter before he denies the experience should ask himself this question: "Have I failed to gain that experience because there is in me some quality lacking or some atrophy of my own true nature?" Humanity is common to all men, but all may not have reached its apex, and in that which is lacking they may discover why certain experiences which come to some never come to them. Arrested development may explain the remarkable dissimilarity between man and man; he who is on the ladder top sees and feels more than they who have halted on a lower rung or even remained stationary at the foot of the ladder, and consequently it is foolish for those lower down the ladder to contradict or ignore what the one on the ladder's top affirms that he sees and feels. Though mankind is not uniform in idea and vision, yet there is something common to all, and the only difference in that which is common is of degree. Emerson in his essay on History stressed this point of a common mental heritage, declaring that only because of such could we in any way enter into the understanding of other people's experiences. It was not book knowledge or scientific technique which enabled a man to explain events in another man's life, but solely his intangible association with that man and with all other men by reason of their common humanity, which gave to each and all something of a mental and spiritual unity and sympathy. "There

is one mind common to all men. Every man is an inlet to the same and to all of the same. He that is once admitted to the right of reason is made a freeman of the whole estate. What Plato has thought he may think; what a saint has felt he may feel; what at any time has befallen any man he can understand. Who hath access to this universal mind is a party to all that is or can be done, for this is the only and sovereign agent. . . . Broader and deeper we must write our annals—from an ethical reformation, from an influx of the ever new, ever sanative conscience—if we would trulier express our central and wide-related nature, instead of this old chronology of selfishness and pride to which we have too long lent our eyes. Already that day exists for us, shines in on us unawares, but the path of science and of letters is not the way into nature. The idiot, the Indian, the child and unschooled farmer's boy, stand nearer to the light by which nature is to be read than the dissector or the antiquary."*

True criticism demands a great respect for truth. It is in many ways good that the modern world should require a high standard of verification and proof before it will accept anything that is strange and unusual as being real and reliable. One of the reasons why science as a study is popular even with people who have not a scientific bent of mind, is that discoveries in the scientific world, however odd and unique, can be demonstrated, proved and explained. There is nothing of the imaginary or suppositional about scientific facts. Science gaily adventures out into the dim unknown and returns with treasures beyond at first human thinking, but in time by cold logic and pure pragmatism the unknown becomes understood. There is a ruthless honesty of procedure in the scientific sphere which, eliminating all chance and belief, puts in their places law and knowledge. Certainty, not credulity, is the characteristic of science, dealing as it does, not with faith, but with fact—*cognosco*, not *credo*.

The position of the mystic is that he has made a discovery as great as any of science, but that he is prevented from giving any clear proof or statement of that which he has discovered, and so he appeals for its acceptance mainly on the ground of faith. That which prevents a clear explanation of the mystical experience is due to a variety of reasons, none of which will be satisfactory evidence for one who has no kinship with the mystic. The inability of human language and logic to express what is beyond them is one of the main preventatives to the mystic who would wish to recount what he has been through. He is aware in himself that he has entered for a fleeting moment

* Emerson, *Essay on History*.

another world in which mundane values have been transvaluated. Spoken or written words are weak tools for the proclamation of a wonder and a glory with which earth has little comparison, and yet with words he must stammer out his experiences or for ever hold his peace.

Though in some degree the mystical experience can be demonstrated—that is, made to work in others who will adopt the same discipline and mode of seeking as that employed by the mystics—it does in the last resort appeal for acceptance by others on the grounds of faith rather than as an indisputable fact of experience capable of ample proof—*credo*, not *cognosco*. Naturally this appears to be its weakness, and affords the sceptical with an apparent argument for its rejection. And the only reply the mystic can make is: "If you had been out *There* with me, then you also would have been aware of that which I have seen, felt and heard." This answer is not an evasion, but a real explanation, only for the sceptic it is of little worth since he is doubtful if *There* is anywhere, and so he does not appreciate the invalidity of his condemnation of a realm to which he is a stranger. Yet the mystic is only emphasizing the point about the ladder—namely, that none is justified in refuting what is said to be seen from the ladder top until he himself has been there. No man who has not trod the *Via Dolorosa* is truly able to contradict Christians and say that they are guilty of a hallucination when they testify that while they were on that Way there walked beside them One like unto the Son of Man.

> One hour in dark Gethsemane
> I walked with Him alone.
> He sees, He knows, He touches me,
> How shall it then be known to you,
> O heart of stone ?*

The mystic knows his experience is valid, even though he cannot authenticate it with proofs and arguments. Only experience can decide. Only by practice can the theory be proved right or wrong. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself,"† and learning may bring one to a newer category of truth. Because the mystical experience seems to be divorced from rationality, that is not the same as saying that it is irrational. It may only be outside of reason (*extra rationem*) because in relation to the limitations of human reason it is super-rational. In the spiritual sphere things are different —space and time are unknown and two and two need not make four—and so unable to be placed under human classifica-

* John Drinkwater.

† John vii. 16, 17.

tions. Reason cannot understand all this, nor can it conceive that that which is not in harmony with earthly reason need not necessarily be irrational and illogical. Human truth and divine truth are not the same, since we see now through a glass darkly, and, further, human truth is always being re-enlightened and enlarged by deeper discernment. So there is a paradox that the only truth which is valid is that which recognizes no finality of truth to human beings so long as they are confined to earth.* This can further be extended into the very dangerous statement that what is considered rational in a temporal world may be irrational in a spiritual world, and correlatively that which now appears irrational in relation to the spiritual world may one day be found to be completely rational, or, if the term be preferred, super-rational. "The wisdom of God is foolishness with men."

What the mystic would wish to say in justification of his experience is that the Supernatural cannot be estimated *sub specie naturæ*. For a moment he soared aloft, made contact with the ultimate Reality, and entered the supernatural world; and so for those on earth, tied to a natural life and conscious of nothing or nobody beyond time and space, to invalidate his experiences is akin to a man born blind rejecting the colour principle in creation simply because he does not behold it in objects of varying hues. Again the mystic would say that the appeal of the sceptic for argument and proof is not sound, and that it resembles a blind man asking to feel and touch a rose so that he may know whether it possesses colour or not. "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe"†—but the print and the wound were there whether he felt them or not.

Yet all this does not relieve the mystic of the burden of responsibility which weighs grievously on him. He feels that he must share with others the bliss of the experiences which have been vouchsafed to him. The good news of the Hereafter is crying in his soul for propagation, and it would be sin not to aid others by declaring to them where he has been and what he has seen. Though words may be futile even to the point of falsity, yet the mystic must recount the glory of God to men and women. "One thing I know. Whereas I was blind, now I see," and as a seer he comes back from his Mount of Transfiguration to a world of blind humanity and labours to tell them something of that which he has witnessed. The response to his explanations is what one would expect—the blind deny the seer's sight. In the opening section of the

* *Revealed* Truth is final.

† John xx. 25.

seventh book of the *Republic*, Plato has graphically told a parable parallel to the mystical seer coming back to the world of blind men. He pictures a subterranean cave in which people live chained from their birth. Their backs are to the cave's entrance and a fire is behind them. Between the fire and the people is a roadway guarded by a wall, which conceals those who travel on the road but does not conceal the shadow of things which they may carry on their heads from being reflected on to the wall facing the prisoners in the caves. So the only things which the entombed men see outside are the shadows of goods carried by people on the roadway, and it is only natural that these shadows should be mistaken for realities, and the only realities that exist. Then Plato says that if one man were to get away from the cave, come up into the light of day and see what was actually occurring in the true world, he would come to understand the optical illusion perpetrated in the cave on him and his fellow-prisoners. If after seeing reality he returned to his fellow-prisoners in the cave and told them of that world above their dark prison, they would make of him a " laughing-stock " and would say that " he had gone up only to come back again with his eyesight destroyed, and that it was not worth while even to attempt the ascent."*

Likewise the mystic comes back to the darkened world to tell of a glorious Light which he has seen and which has made all the difference to his understanding of everything and everybody. Is it strange that he too should be a " laughing-stock " to the sceptics and that they should doubt the normality of his mind ? In spite of opposition he struggles to declare his experiences and ecstasies, and he entreats his hearers and readers to accept them by faith even though reason object. In a way it is an impossible position, because he is using what should be the medium of reason, words, to convince the soul. But because man in his tripartite nature is an unity, the effort need not necessarily fail. Words are mental expressions—that is, they are of the head, the reason—but they can be employed not only to prove rationally but to affect emotionally the heart, and in the final analysis the heart is nearer to the soul than is the head.

But even to affect the heart by giving expression to his experiences is not easy, as has been pointed out, for the mystic. He is baulked by the almost incomprehensibility of what he has encountered, and he knows more than he could ever state. He may employ symbolism to assist him in the problem of portraying to others what is difficult. He may resort to poetry in an effort to reveal what prose could never declare. But

* Plato, *Republic*, Book VII., 514-17.

when every artifice has been employed, a "great gulf fixed" remains between what he has seen and the best picture of it which he can give. He will realize what St. Francis de Sales meant when he wrote in his treatise *On the Love of God* that mystical theology "is called mystical because its conversation is altogether secret, and there is nothing said in it between God and the soul, save only from heart to heart, by a communication, incommunicable to all but those who make it."* He will be one with Dante, who ended his superb *Divina Commedia* on a glorious flight of spiritual imagination yet confessing his weakness to rise higher and the need for leaving the best unexpressed:

> Yet were my pinions all too weak,
> Unto such lofty flight to seek,
> Till to my mind it came
> In flash of lightning flame.
> Here failed the vision, yet my will
> As even wheel was driven still
> By Love, that onward bears
> The Sun and all the stars.†

St. Teresa likewise recognized this barrier which withheld her from declaring the profound realities of the spiritual world which God permitted her to know. "Oh, mighty secrets of God! Never should I weary of trying to explain if I thought it possible to explain! I would write a thousand foolish things that one might be to the point, if only it might make us praise God alone."‡

In another passage, when writing of the delicious sense of nearness to God which she encountered in the "prayer of acquired contemplation," St. Teresa says that that which came to her from God was beyond all human understanding. The realm of spirituality outstrips analysis and comprehension. "A soul, when our Lord begins to bestow these graces upon it, does not understand them, and does not know what to do with itself."§

When the apostle of India, St. Francis Xavier, was under the influence of a spiritual visitation so intense was the feeling that it almost injured him. In an agony of both pain and pleasure he could but exclaim, "Enough, Lord, enough! Spare this poor heart. I can bear no more." Later he could never communicate to others any real understanding of what this experience was, nor could he say what as regards feeling it resembled. There was no analogy which he might employ for such an exquisite visitation of the soul, and even if he had endeavoured to frame one, any justification of his mystical

* *On the Love of God*, Book VI., chapter i.
† Dante, *Paradiso*, xxxiii. 139-45 (trans. C. H. Shadwell).
‡ *Interior Castle*, Fifth M., chapter i. § St. Teresa, *Life*, chapter xiv.

rapture would have been futile even to the point of being ludicrous. Blessed are they who have not felt, but yet have believed the feelings and experiences which God has vouchsafed to others.

St. Paul is superbly vague when he strives to speak of his mystical experiences. As one reads his burning words, so certain of what has happened but so uncertain in explanation of the happening, the feeling comes that he is labouring to express the inexpressible, stumbling along the *via verborum* and totally inadequate to his task of portraying what he means to portray. One passage with its parenthesis of uncertainty and difficulty must suffice to reveal the incoherency of his thought as he labours to bring forth in language what he has previously known after the spirit. No one can read this brief extract without feeling St. Paul fighting against the limitations of logic and words. "I know a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not, or out of the body, I know not: God knoweth), such a one rapt even to the third heaven. And I know such a man (whether in the body or out of the body, I know not: God knoweth), that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard secret words, which it is not granted unto men to utter."*

That supreme saint of the mystical life, John of the Cross, in spite of all his systematic spiritual directions and methods, makes a feeble effort to say what happened to him when his soul united in contemplation with God, and so he merely writes: "I stood nought knowing, all science transcending. If you would listen, this sovereign wisdom doth consist in a sense profound of the essence of God."†

John of Ruysbroeck, in speaking about the "three ways" in which Christ comes to the soul, adds a final warning that these advents of Christ will not be intelligible to those who are uninitiated in the secrets of the interior life of devotion and prayer. "We will now set forth each coming separately. Attend therefore with diligence, for he who has never felt or experienced this, he shall not easily understand it."‡ Later, when referring to the most holy and profound coming of God into the human soul, John suddenly, as it were, stops, withheld by the sheer inadequacy of words to give expression to the most sublime conception of God and man. "This drawing and invitation I cannot well make plain to gross and insensitive men."§ Again, he says almost sadly, "My words are strange, but he who loves will understand."‖

* 2 Cor. xii. 4-11.
† *Canticle on Ecstasy.*
‡ *Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage*, chapter vi.
§ *Ibid.*, chapter xxii.
‖ *Reflections from the Mirror of a Mystic*, p. 76. (Baillie edition.)

Brother Boniface Maes (1627-1706), in a book published originally in Flemish (1668) and entitled *Mystical Theology*, likewise, when speaking of experiences which come to those on the top rungs of the mystical ladder, has these words of explanation for that which he is compelled to omit from his dissertation: " As for what God then works in the soul thus prepared, that, no one can understand, neither he who writes, nor he who reads, nor he who experiences it, for it is incomprehensible."

Such an accurate and careful writer as Plotinus, with all that great wealth of knowledge so carefully stored in his mind, when he comes to speak of the Beyond can do nothing better than exclaim in uncertainty, " He who knows this will know what I mean."

Unlettered St. Angela of Foligna, when she is about to mention her spiritual visitations, stops suddenly her words and cries pathetically, " Not this ! Not this ! I blaspheme."

Tauler briefly remarks on the incomprehensibility of the spirit world—" the Abyss which is unknown and has no name —more beloved than all we can know." Nor is it any accident that he should employ the word which is so well translated as " abyss." He is speaking of something which is profound in its depth and dark in its mysterious majesty, and he is aware that no man on earth can understand what is the length or depth or height of the love of God. So he is content to leave it as the " unknown," though a " beloved " unknown. Similarly, Martin Luther cries out from a satisfied soul but a perplexed mind, " I do not know it, and I do not understand it, but sounding from above, and ringing in my ears, I hear what is beyond the thought of man." The inner meaning of all this incomprehensibility is best explained by the fourteenth-century author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, which with Dionysius the Areopagite's *Mystical Theology* is well worthy of most careful and prayerful reading. Only when human ignorance is accepted, and one reaches out beyond mind to Him who is above mere thought, then one enters in the " divine darkness " and knows God in a way that surpasses ordinary rationality.* St. Bonaventure's teaching is also that the highest mystical experience is not intellectual but an act of will, a union of love. *Ibi non intrat intellectus, sed affectus.*

Abbé Henri Bremond has a brief but significant phrase in his important work *Poetry and Prayer*. He says that " the poet is a broken-down mystic." Now there is a similarity between the poet and the mystic. Both are heirs of beauty and have seen something which to them is full of meaning,

* *Mystical Theology*, part iii., chapter ii., c.

wonder and loveliness. Their souls are brimful with inner experiences which they long to reveal and which are for them the most treasured possessions of their lives. So the poet weaves in words of rhyme and music the story of his vision, desiring all the time that the grandeur of the revelation shall be equally immortalized and honoured by flawless verse. Nothing is too good for the poet's use, and so through words of charm and sensitiveness his experiences in some degree are photographed and relived by the sympathetic reader.

With the mystic the position is identical, only unlike the poet he cannot even so well reveal to others the magnificence of the Beyond. Perhaps it would be wiser to alter Bremond's phrase and so to say that "the mystic is a broken-down poet" —that is, a poet whose finest poetry cannot in the very least do justice to that which he has seen and felt in his spirit.

In conclusion of this point relating to the incomprehensibility of the mystic to explain himself and his experiences, it must be made clear that the barrier which prevents him from declaration is real and due in the main, not to lack of definite experience, but to weakness of language and human nature. To deny the fact of mysticism on the grounds of its insufficiency of explanation is akin to a man watching an aeroplane leave the ground and saying that it cannot fly, merely because he himself is ignorant of, and cannot be taught, the theory of aeronautics. The fact is that the airship does soar aloft into the upper air and that they who know the language of its science can come to understand its movements and the reasons for such. Likewise the mystic does rise above to another world of spirit, and they who know the "science" and the language of that other world, the Beyond, do understand in part what he experienced out there. To deny a fact because one cannot understand it is not so wise as to doubt the omnipotence of an intelligence which cannot understand all things. The wise man is he who with Socrates affirms his own ignorance, knowing only that he does not know, and not denying truth to that which he does not know nor understand. Professor Joad sums up the whole position by blandly saying, "If mysticism could give an account of itself it would not be mysticism,"* because it would *non-mystically* have explained all of itself. Elsewhere Professor Joad says that the rare sphere which the genuine philosopher enters by the medium of pure philosophy finds him out of his depth in thought, because he has gone further than mere intellect can travel. He has made a leap off intellect and landed on super-intellect, and this experience, Joad says, is akin to that which comes

* C. E. M. Joad, *Return to Philosophy*, p. 54.

to the great mystics and the creative artists. "There is a moment in the philosopher's vision when logical truth is transcended, and there is a direct intuitive vision of that which lies beyond, a realm, I would suggest, not fundamentally different from that approached by the mystic and the artist."* The parallel is not inadequate provided it is borne in mind that the deepest philosopher and the most creative artist look at the book or the picture in which they have sought to objectify for others the thought or experience which has been vouchsafed to them, and are dismayed to find how feebly it resembles and portrays that which it was intended to do. With the mystic, they can but say, "We cannot declare all we have seen and heard, and what we do declare we leave for those who have been acquainted with experiences such as ours to accept." Or, as Plotinus puts the same point: "Remember that there are parts of what it most concerns you to know which I cannot describe to you; you must come and see for yourselves. The vision is for him who will see it."

PATRICK COWLEY.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND†

DURING the last century bishops generally held a visitation every third year, and published the charges that they delivered to their clergy on these occasions, documents which are of the highest value to the ecclesiastical historian of that period. They not only enable him to discover the views of the authors on the burning questions of the day, but often provide him with statistics and other material from which the efficiency of the Church of England in the various dioceses can be fairly accurately assessed. While many of the details to be found in these triennial publications are of purely ephemeral interest, there remains a large residue from which the investigator can draw his conclusions not only as to the views and character of the bishop in question, but as to the general state of his diocese.

The historian's great difficulty, whatever side of life he tries to investigate, is to discover the true *average*. Great failures and great successes are easily discoverable, but it is far harder to assess accurately the general mean which, just because it is the mean, seldom if ever secures any record. Anyone can find

* *The Element of Greatness in Philosophy*, p. 72. (Aristotelian Society lecture, January, 1935.)

† *Common Order in Christ's Church*, by G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester. A charge arising from a primary visitation of the Diocese of Chichester. April, 1937.

out who won the high jump at his school sports fifty years ago and the height he jumped. It is just possible that there is some record kept of the height attained by the worst jumper in the school. It is the height that the average boy could jump that can never be known.

Church history is largely a record of great saints and great sinners, because the average Christian, with his virtues and his vices more or less cancelling each other, catches no eye and attracts no notice, inspires no glowing panegyric and evokes no shuddering opprobrium. Hagiology deals with the rare exception, and if there were a systematic study of the lives of the vilest so-called Christians, that too would deal with the phenomenal. Everyone who owns an Encyclopædia can stretch out his arm and get at least a superficial knowledge of St. Francis of Assisi and Pope Alexander VI., but to come to true estimate of the influence of the Church of Christ on the Italian people in the thirteenth or fifteenth centuries would involve the perusal of masses of records which, for the most part, have perished.

It is for this reason that diocesan statistics, arid as the study of them may be, are of such value. A fair estimate may be secured of the strength and weakness of the Church at any particular time and place. The " First Pastoral Charge " of Bishop Magee of Peterborough, republished in *Christ the Light of all Scripture*, gives that great prelate's estimate of the Church in three shires in 1872 in words which will bear reading today by all who are interested in the ecclesiastical history of the last century. Though not temperamentally optimistic, and by no means shutting his eyes to defects and abuses, he writes cheerfully and hopefully, as one who sees the tide flowing. Much the same applies to the famous primary charge of Bishop Tait of London, delivered in 1858.

Bishop Bell, on the contrary, is despondent. It is true that he says: " There are many parishes in which, I am thankful to say, a high standard of pastoral work is reached and has been maintained for years together. There are some (in every deanery, I think) in which there is outstanding leadership—where the gospel is preached and the people respond with imagination and vivacity, and where experiments (especially among the younger people) are made with uncommon rewards. There are cases, and it is only right that I should say so, in which effort is not made, and there is a real slackness, if not in the technical sense ' neglect.' But these latter cases are rare exceptions " (pp. 6 and 7). But he goes on: " I want to encourage; and it is my hope that the words which, by God's grace, I may be led to speak, may bear a full measure of

encouragement. But it is necessary to see the realities of Church life with unmistakable clarity, if we are to go hopefully and seriously forward. I am bound therefore to acknowledge that the facts which the returns from incumbents present as to the actual hold of the Church on the people in the parishes are very disquieting" (p. 8). The bishop is prepared to discount to some extent the witness of statistics, but he is disturbed, as all his brethren must be to a greater or less extent, at the decline in church attendance, particularly among the young. He quotes the remark of one incumbent, though probably many made or were tempted to make a similar comment: "There is a large void in the congregation between twenty and forty." The bishop adds: "I am afraid that the void begins even earlier than at twenty." He observes that "this detachment of the population from our services and our Church (and from other Christian communions as well) is no proof of hostility." He has as much sense as Bishop John Wordsworth of the power of "diffused Christianity," and pays a just tribute to the influences for good in the wireless and the Press. But the impression left upon his mind is evidently akin to that which we all feel when we see the driving-wheels of a powerful locomotive spinning round at a great speed, but neither gripping the rails nor moving the train.

The incumbent's replies, amounting in all to upwards of 25,000, the mere reading of which must have been a vast labour, shew that the symptoms of this alienation from religion are well understood. The bishop mentions some of them, but proceeds further to the diagnosis of the disease. "They are going faster and faster because they are running away from themselves. They are, in reality, trying to escape. They don't know where to go. And they need a goal. You will perceive this need of a goal if you study modern literature." Time was when it was said, fairly or otherwise,

> "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed."

It is otherwise today. The sheep are not hungry.

Bishop Bell makes suggestions for coping with this alienation, not from religion, but from the outward practice and profession of it. He stresses, and by no means before it was needed, the duty of pastoral visitation. "At our ordination as priests we were instructed by the Bishop 'to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever.' It behoves every parish priest therefore to go forth in his search, and to visit." It is distressing to hear clergymen say that they "don't believe in

visiting." This has always been rather a *forte* of the Anglican clergy. "Visiting, it seems, is peculiar to the genius of the English Church. She may not be able to boast of many great preachers; she may be thought by some to be backward in social work, but this, at least, she is acknowledged to be by friend and foe—a great visitor." So wrote the Bishop of London in 1895, when Head of the Oxford House in Bethnal Green. "I know my sheep and am known of mine"—how can this be accomplished without diligent visiting? Time and circumstances may modify in various ways the work of the parish priest, but people still live in homes, and still admire the faithful shepherd who, as they put it, "gets about among the people." When he is no longer ushered into the formal and stuffy front parlour, but is admitted into the intimacy of the back kitchen, he has accomplished something. He can never be like the lawyer or physician, who wait till they are summoned. He may see little result from his labours, but then the same applies to the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments. Yet his successor, if not he himself, sees the bread that has been cast on the waters, and bread always swells in water. In some few cases it may happen that the motor-car in which the flock deserts the fold on Sundays conveys the shepherd outside the parish on week-days, but more frequently lack of visiting is due to a sense of its futility. But if it accomplishes nothing else it at least enables the priest to become familiar with the life and thoughts of his people, and how can he preach Sunday after Sunday unless he knows by actual personal intercourse with all his people their difficulties and their needs?

The Bishop of Chichester urges also the need of teaching with the Church. "The special form (as I believe) which evangelism should be taking now is the evangelism of teaching" (p. 58). He only devotes twenty lines to Church day schools. If these tend to grow fewer it is surely all the more reason for concentrating on those that remain, and yet here too may be heard the voices of incredulity: "I don't believe in Church schools." The Bishop seems to regard the parish priest rather as the kindly visitor than as the regular teacher. "Where he is willing to take real trouble, that is to say to try to understand something about effective methods of teaching, he should take the Scripture lesson on a regular day or days in school." Is not this an understatement? A day school teacher of some years' experience will doubtless accomplish more than the most erudite deacon, yet a priest of a few years' experience will surely be able to teach one subject better than a man or woman who has to teach several. "I leave it to the

teachers: they can do it better than I can "—such a confession of weakness, not seldom heard, is not creditable.

In regard to the Sunday teaching of the Church's children the Bishop faces the fact that there is a decline in membership. "Yet after reading Return after Return showing a decrease in the attendance of Sunday school children, it was an immense encouragement to read——" and here follows a story of increase in membership from "a town parish of about 2,000 inhabitants, almost entirely labourers and casual workers" (pp. 61, 62).

The Bishop concludes his charge with an exhortation to diligent study on the part of the clergy. "How can we keep our minds fresh, or wax stronger and riper in our ministry, without regular study?" (p. 69). The difficulty here is twofold, want of time and want of stimulus. "You have all the time there is," urged Archbishop Temple, and yet in many parishes the parson cannot count on any one uninterrupted hour. In the economic circumstances of the day he must often be to some extent housemaid and cook and gardener and chauffeur all in one, and in large urban areas his time is constantly interrupted by hearing a confession, signing a form, marrying, burying, attending meetings, and generally dissipating his energies. Stimulus to study was provided in the old days by the incumbent of a college living, an ex-don whose example and influence radiated an atmosphere of culture among his brethren. College livings are filled still, but by men of less intellectual calibre if, in some cases, of greater pastoral efficiency, and there may be no one in the rural deanery to take the lead among the brethren in Bible or other theological study. Might it be possible for all the clergy in any deanery voluntarily to submit themselves to the annual discipline of an examination? If a priest knew that he had committed himself to a definite piece of study on which he had to secure a certain percentage of marks, he would possibly find a stimulus that is at present lacking. No stream can flow higher than its source, and a teaching Church must first be a learning Church. Yet a learning Church must needs be a teaching Church, and the more men learn the more eager they will be to pass on their learning to others. With the present enthusiasm for education all around them the clergy have to keep pace. So far as the theological colleges are concerned they do so: the examinations for Holy Orders are about twice as stiff as they were thirty years ago. But the fact remains that it takes twice as long to make a dentist as it does to make a priest, and bishops have been known to admit men, particularly those of what the Prayer Book calls "riper years," on the recommendation of Principals of Theological Colleges whose hearts are more tender

than their discretion is sound. Such men need all the encouragement they can get to continue their theological studies regularly and systematically.

The middle of Bishop Bell's charge is concerned with the worship of the Church, and here again he is pessimistic. He uses the same epithet again. "The facts which the Returns from incumbents present as to the actual hold of the Church on the people are very disquieting" (p. 8). "The situation which the Returns reveal [as to departures from the Prayer Book in the Communion Office] is of a most disquieting character" (p. 33). While "the great majority . . . faithfully use the form prescribed in the Prayer Book" the remainder seem to indulge in almost every conceivable permutation and combination of variations, to say nothing of insertions and omissions. "Various forms of altar Missal are used, sometimes even different altar Missals with different arrangements by different priests in the same church" (p. 34). It is not one school of thought only that is to blame, for there are those who omit "the whole of the *ante-Communion*" and use "*Extempore Prayer* before the *Blessing*," but the Bishop rightly stigmatizes such variations as "Congregationalist" (pp. 37, 39). He makes the position of *Ecclesia anglicana* perfectly plain, and recalls the clergy to their vow: "In Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacrament I will use the form in the said Book and none other." Let it not be supposed that this Congregationalism is confined to the Holy Communion Service. Revision of the Prayer Book is still with us, but it is not the revision of the Church as a whole, but of the individual minister. Many worshippers are irritated by arbitrary and wholly unauthorized modifications, such as "Our Father *who*," the substitution of "Spirit" for "Ghost," the addition of the ascription to the Trinity to the Collect of the day, and such-like pin-pricks, things trivial in themselves and of no doctrinal import, but jarring. The truth is that the clergyman conducting a service is, if the expression may be pardoned, gramophonic. He is to the Church what the disc is to the singer. He is the voice of the Church. He must be loud enough to be heard, and he will naturally do his part reverently and intelligently, but very rarely has he the option implied by "or this," and then only to choose between two prayers or canticles. If he takes prayer meetings, by all means let him have them, and *call them such*, but he is not dealing fairly with the Church as a whole if he modifies the Prayer Book Offices, even if it be in a way that is acceptable to the bulk of his congregation.

Bishop Magee (*Life*, ii., p. 272) put the matter in his trenchant

way in 1889: "The question they really had to settle was *whether a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England was at liberty to say and do in his parish church whatever he liked.* . . . A beneficed clergyman . . . was not chosen by his parishioners. He was imposed upon them, whether they liked him or not, and he was irremovable by them. . . . A Nonconformist might use what prayers he liked in his congregation on Sunday, but they had the right to dismiss him on Monday if they did not like the prayers. The Nonconformist *prayed* as he pleased, and the congregation paid as they pleased." All this is perfectly true, but it merely stresses the legal position. Of far greater importance (as Magee would have been the first to admit) is the relation of the individual minister to the Church as a whole. "Pray with the Church" is the title of this section of Bishop Bell's charge, and that is what priest and people, according to the polity of the Church of England, "assemble and meet together" to do.

Or course, the Bishop permits such deviations as were permitted in 1928, although he admits that the "Alternative Order has neither statutory nor canonical authority" (p. 41). Yet it has "very high authority of an informal kind," and therefore such modifications of the Book of 1662 as it sanctions may be made. Beyond this Bishop Bell will not go, and indeed how can he? What authority has he to do so? As he truly remarks: "I am not a private Bishop." He is as much bound by the Book of Common Prayer as the youngest deacon. And so, with manifest sympathy for all to whom his injunctions may be especially burdensome, he orders all his clergy "to bring their services of Holy Communion into conformity" with his injunctions "by Christmas next" (p. 56).

At the same time it is but fair to those clergymen who modify the services of the Church otherwise than the Book of 1928 permitted to say that such modifications are not always made by men whose leanings are toward Rome or Geneva. Many of them feel, reasonably or otherwise, that the Prayer Book is out of harmony with the spirit of the age. Bishop Bell finds that "in only 16 parishes is (the Litany) used every Sunday" (p. 21). He writes with great appreciation (which all his clergy share) of "a most noble prayer of intercession," and urges its general use, a course which, not being "a private bishop," he is logically as well as morally bound to take. At the same time he deplores the absence from church of the young. He was young once himself—what are his recollections of his youthful reaction to the Litany? It may be that some of the incumbents who neglect to use it on Sundays have their younger parishioners in mind. A priest who is

a bigoted Anglican and yet does not use the Book, the whole Book and nothing but the Book is, he believes, meeting the needs of the bulk of his parishioners. He may be acting mistakenly from the standpoint of ecclesiastical order, but he is not necessarily trying to stamp his own personality on his flock but rather endeavouring to lead them to the Throne of Grace in words and forms which may make that approach as easy as possible. He is probably very grateful for the liberty given to him by the Book of 1928, and avails himself freely of it, but he may feel that the revision was on too conservative lines. The basic defect of the Book of 1662 was that it was what it called itself, a *Prayer* Book. The element of thanksgiving and praise is very small, and what there is has, for the most part, been taken from Jewish sources. There was no "General Thanksgiving" till 1662, and the Communion Service has a very small element of praise. True, there is the *Sursum Corda* and the *Gloria*, but the latter soon becomes a prayer. The same may be said of the *Te Deum*: it is the Jewish *Omnia Opera* that sustains the note of praise to the end. May not it be this unending petitionary element that irks the mind of youth? The young feel the need of prayer less than the old. They have, as a rule, health, work, interests, pleasures, and, if not wealth, at least a competence. They do not, for the most part, feel that they are "miserable sinners." But it is possible that they would respond with greater alacrity to an office of praise and thanksgiving, as congregational as the Litany, but less subjective and introspective, as wide in its sweep but more cheerful in its tenor. At any rate, if they ask us to compare the proportion of praise to petition in the longer form of the Lord's Prayer with that in the Book of Common Prayer we shall be forced to confess to a considerable discrepancy.

Nevertheless, until the day comes when "through a Round-Table Conference or otherwise, an agreement may be reached between the different schools of thought in the Church of England in this and other matters" (p. 48) the duty of the priest is obvious. To the Book of 1662 he has sworn allegiance, and if the modifications of eight years ago do not satisfy him he must agitate for more, but for unconstitutional liturgical revision to suit the taste of himself or his congregation there can be no justification, whether logical, moral, legal or theological.

In conclusion, while we commend this book to the purchase and perusal of our readers, we would not have them share the despondency of its author. His is not that facile optimism that looks only at the bright side of things and refuses to see the

shadows: he deserves well of all Anglican churchmen for the candour with which he faces the present " slump " in religion. Readers of his charge who feel as " disquieted " as its author may reflect that religion is like the sea, in a constant state of ebb and flow. In the eighteenth century Bishop Butler found himself compelled to take a pessimistic view of the state of religion in England, but John Wesley's great revival had already begun, and a little more patience and forbearance on either side would have retained within the bounds of the Church of England the revivifying forces to which in its seemingly moribund state it had given birth. Nearly a century later John Keble preached his " assize " sermon. A prominent politician had bidden the Church to set its house in order and Bishop Blomfield had said: " It is not too late for us to put fresh incense into our censers and to stand between the dead and the living," with results that we all know. Today, 104 years after the beginning of the Oxford Movement, churchmen, and indeed Christians of all denominations in nearly every European country, may feel at times as despondent as Joseph Butler and John Keble, but the revival will come.

There is, however, one thing which will retard, but cannot prevent, that revival. It is but just to Dr. Bell to say that he is utterly without it, however disquieted he may be. It is that which Dr. Dorothy Brock, at the conclusion of her intensely interesting letter quoted on pp. 64, 65, says " keeps some young people away from the Church "—namely, " the defeatist attitude." Two or three preachers on the " wireless " have been guilty of what Dean Hook called " crying stinking fish," blatantly asserting that the Church has failed and voicing its heartfelt contrition. Let all those who speak of the Church's failure ask themselves what " failure " means, and what " the Church " means. The " Body of Christ " cannot " fail." What they mean is that the ecclesiastical shop (distinguished from other emporia by a spire and a bell and similar differentia) is failing to attract large numbers of customers; or, as Bishop Bell puts it, " The Church is often regarded as an organization for providing religious services for those who want them " (p. 14). The truth, of course, is that you cannot judge religion by worldly criteria. A given religious edifice may be " popular " for the worst of reasons, or unpopular from the best. Good can never be " popular " with evil. " The Jewish Church was living when the Jews hung their harps on the willows and could find no voice to sing the songs of Zion amidst the mockery of her enemies: the Jewish Church was dead when multitudes thronged her temple, whose gilded roof rose glittering in the sun, while the feet of those that should carry out the nation

to judgment were even then at its doors" (Magee: *The Gospel and the Age*, p. 232). "Through evil report and good report" the Church lives on, and all down her history the proverb has remained true: "It is always darkest before the dawn." To those whose hearts are failing them for fear and whose spirits are saddened by row upon row of empty pews, the old text, so happily quoted by the Bishop of Chichester, must surely bring its eternal message of encouragement: "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give to you the Kingdom."

R. S. T. Haslehurst.

OUR WORSHIP AND OUR FAITH

Every religion has three permanent aspects which, although distinct, interpenetrate and profoundly affect one another. These are cult or worship, creed or belief, and conduct or behaviour. In this paper our interest will be directed primarily to cult and creed and their relationship; but it must necessarily take into consideration the third aspect, conduct. Genuine Christian belief, actualized in worship, must inevitably lead to "action." We need not subscribe to a pragmatic view of the nature of truth to assert that failure to produce Christian behaviour among men is a fair indication that cult and creed are either imperfectly accepted and understood, or are of a type not in relation with the reality of things.

The reflections which are here set down follow a reading of several books, chief among them Father Hebert's remarkably able and stimulating *Liturgy and Society*. In this volume, the author writes eloquently of Christian worship and its central place in the life of the believing community. Another (and, in our opinion, more fully rounded) work is that of Miss Evelyn Underhill, who, in *Worship*, published in the Library of Constructive Theology, has sketched the significance of the corporate act of adoration which is at the heart of Christianity. The Mansfield College symposium, *Christian Worship*, is also of interest; and there are many other recent books which discuss this important subject, and show that there is a growing realization of its focal position in the life of the Christian Church.

What is the Christian faith, for the expression of which Christian worship exists? It is impossible, of course, to present a complete statement, but one may hope that a summary will be adequate for our purposes. In its personal side—that is, in its immediate religious meaning—we may say

that the Christian faith is a living awareness of the presence, reality, power and love of God intensively operative in Jesus Christ, and known through fellowship with other believers in the community which in some sense was brought into being by Him.

When this immediate religious faith is articulated into a theological dogma (we shall discuss the meaning of dogma at a later point in this paper), it is at once seen to involve a universe which is through and through incarnational. The Divine Reality of God is inevitably seen to be both more than His world, and yet expressed in and through that world. In its several degrees of significant expression it is seen to be revelatory of Reality's nature and purpose. In such a world-order, at every point sustained and penetrated by Reality, the Christian sees the total content of the life of Jesus Christ (including His human history, His teaching, His death and His continued presence among men) as the most significant event or act in the whole series of events or acts of God which constitute the universe and our own part in it.

In other words, God's supreme, sufficient and definitive self-disclosure among men, as man and to men, is in this historic human life and that which it has brought to pass in the world. Here is the "main-stream" of divine revelation, the distinctive but not the exclusive nor exhaustive visitation by God to His human children. And it is an action wrought out by the employment of common material, life as every man knows and possesses it. Material things, human life, ordinary affairs are invested with new meaning, for they have been used just as they are (although doubtless made more perfect each in its order) for that most adequate self-manifestation of Deity. Incidentally, it follows that man and the world are therefore *capax deitatis*; even sin is a defect, not a radical perversion or total depravity.

It is precisely because God is so securely found here, or rather discovers Himself to men, that the entire world and human history are understood to be of a piece with that specially significant event. In Christ we have the emergence (a phrase which does *not* mean "from below," as those who criticize its theological use seem invariably to suggest) of something genuinely new from within a greater and inclusive continuity. That is to say, Christ is not a catastrophic, unrelated intrusion of God into an otherwise quite orderly system; we can make no sense of His appearance, and it would have no revelational value, if this were true. Rather, He is harmonious with and expressive of the whole movement of God to His creation. That movement is focussed for us men

incarnationally, as man (because *we* are men), in the person of Christ.

Involved in this belief is the doctrine of the Christian Church, for it is impossible to separate Christ from that organism which came into being through His total activity in the world, whether or not it was "founded" by Him in the narrower sense of the word. Entrance into the faith in Christ and participation in His "benefits" is through membership in the fellowship. We need not discuss here what are the defining marks of the fellowship; suffice it to say that the Church, as the unity whose informing life is the very life of the divine-human Lord, is as much a part of the gospel as that Lord Himself. It follows that the work of the Church is to continue the reconciling, incarnating activity of God in Christ, so making His life and power available to men and women today. Here, in the blessed community, there is the fellowship of Holy Spirit; here, the most adequate response is being made ideally through creation to the self-giving of God, precisely because it is ideally the channel through which the most complete self-giving of God is conveyed to men. Here life, in its widest meaning, is being used, as it is intended to be used, of God, for God, and returning to God in love, sacrifice, devotion and service.

It is in the effort to interpret these stupendous facts that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was developed. It was not a merely intellectual or philosophical scheme; its purpose (as Dr. Prestige shows in his new volume on the patristic doctrine of God) was to safeguard the facts of the Christian religious experience. In its completed form it asserts that the Divine Reality, eternally love, is therefore eternally self-expressive: *bonum diffusivum sui*. That Self-Expression (we capitalize because we mean to indicate an eternal mode of the Divine Being) has brought about the created world, where it is revealed in varying degrees of significance, and decisively for and among men in Jesus Christ. He is the Divine Self-Expression actualized in human life, Word-made-flesh. Throughout the creation, as in the Divine Reality Himself, there is a Response to God as Creator, a Response itself divine, the great "Amen." That Response is most complete as the outgoing Self-Expression is most complete. The full doctrine of the Trinity, insisting that God reveals Himself as He actually is, goes on to say that in the Godhead itself there are therefore three distinguishable but inseparable eternal modes of being or activity: Creative Source, Self-Expression, Response, Trinity in Unity, Unity in Trinity.

Such is the fundamental Christian dogma. We have stated

it in somewhat unconventional language, because in so doing it may be given more point; and we emphasize the use of the word "dogma." For dogma is not in its truest sense some speculative definition to which the assent of the human mind is required, but the "expression of a common faith in the strength of which a common life is lived by a community of people" (Canon Green in his recent commentary on St. Matthew). The dogmatic foundation which has been expounded is not therefore to be understood as an attempt to describe philosophically and precisely the inner being of God; rather it is the essential content of what we may call the "faith-life" which makes the Christian community possible at all, implicit in the Christian life with God known in Christ in the fellowship of the faithful. Hence we have room for expansion, development, and restatement; this very paper has offered something of that sort. It is dynamic and alive, not static and dead. We wish to put this the more plainly, since the writer is one of those whom Father Hebert might condemn as "modernist"—a term which sometimes he uses not entirely fairly, and one which calls up for him horrible thoughts! It is important to show, and we have attempted here to do so, that, at any rate for a "modernist" in the Anglican and Catholic sense of the word, all the essential points for which he pleads have profound value.

So far for Christian faith. What of Christian worship?

Historically, the worship of the Christian community has been centred round the great events of the life, death and resurrection of Christ. It is of Christian faith that, by union with Christ, the believer is brought into a right relationship with the Divine Reality, realizes his sonship to God, and so finds new and rich life, new and rich meaning in all life. The purpose of Christian worship has been to make the fact of Christ—what He is, was, did and still does, with its pregnant significance—a living reality for the believer. In this way, the followers of Christ share in His victory, and empowered by His grace are conformed to His likeness: the likeness, mind you, which is their inheritance as children of God and brethren of Christ.

Christian worship is not primarily concerned with "techniques" for developing the spiritual life. It is directed to God, and celebrates the whole of life as given by God. And it does this by making it possible for men to take a living, active part in the centrally significant Christian event, the whole life of Christ as self-giving of God and self-offering of man. Thus, while Christian worship has always been towards God, it has been performed in the spirit and through the media-

tion of Jesus Christ. For His work as " mediator " is not the interposition of one between God and man, but the self-giving of God and the self-offering of man which most sufficiently brings God and man together in mutual love.

The distinctive act of Christian worship is the Eucharist. We need not discuss the origin and development of this service; suffice it to say that it is the direct and legitimate result of Christ's action, and that its history follows a straight line from the Last Supper (and whatever was said and done there) to the celebration in our parish church this morning. The special significance of that service is in its association with the life, death, and continued presence of Christ, interpreted as God's supremely characteristic and uniquely effectual action among men, and as man's full response to that work of God. Bread and wine are there taken and through the action of God are charged with a new significance.

That means that there are two important points in the Eucharist. In the first place, there is sacrifice. The Eucharist is " the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby." It is in some sense identified with Christ's life poured out to be the life of His Kingdom and through effectual symbols made available to His faithful people. So much seems to be involved in the scene at the Last Supper. It is also communion. The life—instinct as it was with love from God to man and man to God—is shared together, so that it may be reflected in every range of common life. There is a participation in " the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful," so that all human endeavour may be brought to the level of that sacrificial communion.

Here then, most signally, is entrance into the Christian event and its meaning. And this action is through material things, in line with the incarnational and sacramental action of God Himself who is revealed through dirt and flower, sun and rain, daily bread, human life and fellowship. In the fine words of the Reverend R. D. Richardson at the Oxford Modern Churchmen's Conference of 1936: " The manifold significance of Jesus is set forth in the Church's central act of worship, the Eucharist. There the simplest elements of human sustenance, bread and wine, are made vehicles of spiritual life; the Cross is commemorated; Redemption experienced; and for a brief moment the disciples of Jesus, united in Him, share His life in the Kingdom of God."

Some final remarks may be permitted. Christian worship, so centred, is not accidental to our religion, but is an integral part of it. This is because it is the assertion, the enactment,

of the meaning of the Christian event and participation in the power there released. But it is also the self-offering of the community, its return to the Giver of salvation. It has not been completely understood unless it is also seen as the self-oblation of every Christian man and woman, in union with Christ's great self-oblation, as " a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice " unto God. In its deepest meaning it is the effective symbol for the offering of the whole creation back to God through man, response in Holy Spirit (if we may recall what was said earlier) to the action of God Self-Expressing and Self-Expressed. It is Christian worship which both actualizes the Christian event and represents the self-oblation of all creation to God; which also unites faith and life so that that which we believe and say may be wrought out in our lives. Without such action, Christian worship is sterile; without the worship which gives point to the action, life is futile. This was what St. Augustine meant when, with his keen feeling for the Church as Body of Christ, he wrote that we eat what we are, we become what we eat: the Body of Christ, His instrument and His very self to our human fellows, that they too may grow up to the measure of the stature of Christ.

Finally, Christian worship is corporate, not individual. The individual has his place, it is true; but in this great act of worship it is the fellowship, as symbolic of the whole of the *orbis terrarum*, which offers itself to God, and receives His loving power. Worship is the true expression of the Christian life in fellowship with God and with men; it is the true expression of the Church's being as central (although not only) channel of such fullness of life. Once more, then, it is seen that faith, worship and life are an organic unity. The Athanasian Creed says: " The Catholic Faith is this: that we worship. . . ." That is true; worship is essential, integral, the heart of religion. But unless it is reflected in the whole content of our life, and unless we strive through Christian action to make this a world where worship with the whole of *their* lives is possible for all men, even the humblest, we stand under condemnation. For we are then the salt which has lost its savour.

W. Norman Pittenger.

MISCELLANEA

A SPIRITUAL MASTER

Lovers of Peter Lippert, S.J., feel his death as that of a personal friend. He passed away December 18, 1936, at Locarno. He lived at Munich and broadcast from thence every Saturday. He has left a goodly number of books, little known as yet, I suppose, in England. Two of these consist of spiritual letters, *Briefe in ein Kloster* and *Von Seele zu Seele*. It was through the second that I came to know him. I was attracted by the publishers' notice and bought it on speculation, to find that I had lighted on a master of the spiritual life whose works I could but follow up. The second, the *Letters to a Religious*, has a remarkable history. Peter Lippert was intimate with a young German whom he was training in the Way, when to his surprise one day he had a letter from this boy to say that he was sure he had a vocation for the religious life. Peter Lippert, who knew his penitent through and through, thought differently and tried to dissuade him. But the youth was sure, and Peter Lippert came to see that it was even so. He joined a community and was allowed to write freely and frequently to his old director. He was allowed to keep all these letters, and it was understood that at his death these letters should be returned to his old friend. He fell ill, and the Abbot informed Peter Lippert of his illness and asked if he would like to come and see him. Peter Lippert replied that he would much like to come, and he had something to say to him which he did not want to put into a letter. He added: "Is there anything I can do for you?" and finished: "Down here or up there we shall meet. I am yours for time and for eternity." The meeting did not come off. Deodatus (the young man's name in religion) was to meet his director "up there."

The letters are published in full without comment. One or two quotations will shew their value. Deodatus had written: "I have no use for some of the brethren here"; and Peter Lippert replied: "That is not the right approach: say rather, What do they need that I can give them?" Again, when his community sent him out of the convent to do parish work, he wrote to Peter Lippert: "I could have done this sort of work without ever becoming a religious"; and Peter Lippert replied: "Of course you could, but you would have done it in quite a different way."

His latest book, *Einsam und Gemeinsam* (*Alone and in Common with Others*), has a long meditation on the Journey to Emmaus of great beauty. In it there is a passage which says that God deals with souls in a way they cannot understand. He turns them back all of a sudden and allows them to face some suffering just because He feels that they can stand anything that He does, their love is so strong it will not falter. It is not too much to say that one cannot read this meditation without being lifted to heights one could never have guessed at alone.

Then there are the six volumes called *Credo*, with the titles: (1) God; (2) The Trinity; (3) God and the World; (4) The Redeemer; (5) The Grace of God; (6) The Sacraments of Christ. An outstanding passage here speaks of the soul's shrinking from the idea of reward till it discovers

that the reward is just the being drawn into the near presence of the Redeemer, and as she realizes that, she ceases to shrink back.

All Peter Lippert's books are cheap and have run through many editions.* He had the certainty of touch which draws a soul out of its narrowness and self-pity into the wide life of God, and though he is quite unsparing in the searching condemnations to which he gives expression, he is full of a tenderness which he can only have learnt from the Master in whose immediate presence he now dwells.

Translations into English of the Spiritual Letters and the *Credo* are much to be desired. *Von Seele zu Seele* has been translated into French under the title *Cœurs Inquiets*, and there has been published recently *A Modern Job talks with God*, which is probably a translation of *Der Mensch Job*. As far as I know, nothing else has been done by way of making Peter Lippert's work accessible to the English reader.

The *Credo* volumes shew an intimate acquaintance with Christian doctrine, transfigured and made apparent in the life of the soul and suffused with warmth of feeling and assurance of faith. I conclude with one or two passages:

> "God is the most secret of all mysteries and yet the most evident. Ever we are face to face with enigmas, and whichever way we turn we are aware of the touch of a hand laid on us, of a voice calling to us, a mysterious voice which we feel we can absolutely trust. Everywhere we trace Spirit, Power, Greatness, Goodness, but all are veiled. They are, as it were, a shadow which tells us that One is coming to us, but the shadow is vast, without beginning and without ending. What life and love and strength are comes over us in inexhaustible revelation and fills us with a child's delight, not without foreboding. Who is He that cometh?"†
>
> "We are made free. Sin, the deadly foe, is smitten. The soul is no longer crushed by self-reproaches, anxieties give place to happy thankfulness and quiet trust and childlike service. Disquieting anticipations of the future are dispelled. Maybe the redeemed soul will fall again into sin, but his will is held up stiffly to God, there is daylight in the soul, the man can see the approaching danger, conscience gives warning, storm clouds gather. So sin for the redeemed is the exception. It does not crouch at the door. The soul must trample down the grace of God before he can go over to the enemy."‡
>
> "'Arise and walk,' He says to our lame will. Man cannot stand against the assault of evil in his own strength. He is liable to give way, out of idleness and weariness, and only grace can reassure him. Our sick soul needs that healing grace if it is to hold out to the end. Even the redeemed need the guiding light, ever and again God must stretch out His hand to aid them.
>
> "We get glimpses like lightning flashes when some high thought floods our souls with light and, like Saul of Tarsus, we begin life afresh. We are filled with joy, our eyes gleam with a new light. Then it is that the call reaches us and we make decisions that affect our life for time, maybe for eternity."§

* They are published by Herder.

† *Credo*, "God," vol. i., p. 1.

‡ *Credo*, "The Redeemer," vol. iv., p. 135.

§ *Ibid.*, "The Grace of God," vol. v., p. 30.

"God manifests Himself to man in the overflowing of His love. So great is the impulse of that love that it communicates itself to souls till they too overflow with love. They spend and are spent. The rank of a soul is determined by its capacity for transmitting love. God gives Himself not only to the souls He quickens but to them also who believe through their word. The creature becomes the creator, the begotten becomes the begetter, the fruits of the Spirit are not merely received but propagated."*

K. H. Nixon Smith.

P.S.—Since writing the above, details have reached me of Peter Lippert's death. He was only fifty-eight years old. His home was at Munich, but he used to winter further south. Last year he was at Locarno. One day he caught a chill to which he did not attach much importance; however, he went to the Clinica S. Agnese on December 10. The Sister-in-charge was alarmed and sent for a doctor. He found his patient suffering from pneumonia and pleurisy. For some days the illness appeared to be taking a favourable course, but there came a collapse. He sent to a Jesuit Father whom he had known for sixteen years, at whose hands he wished to receive the last sacraments. This Father arrived about 4 a.m. on December 18. Peter asked him to hear his confession then and there. He was anointed and made his last communion. He was conscious almost to the end, and was able to give the necessary directions as to the notice of his death and as to his possessions. He was happy and patient and as light-hearted as a child. About midday he became much worse, and by 2 p.m. he was facing imminent death. His friend writes: "I said to him, 'Peter, you are going home.' He gave me a happy look and said, 'Now?' I said, 'Yes, soon.' He seemed satisfied, and prayed aloud in low tones. About 4 p.m. the end came." His body was taken to the Bethlehem Institute at Immensee, the beautiful spot that he so much loved. The Fathers had made a new cemetery high up on one of the hills, and there they took him in the early morning, a thick fog making it impossible to see the institute from the cemetery. He was the first priest to lie there." One of the Fathers went up again at noon, and a little child came along, about six years old, folded his hands and prayed. The Father writes: "I could not help saying to him, 'Do you know whose grave this is?' and the child said timidly that he did not know. He only knew that it was the grave of a priest."

There is an In Memoriam leaflet with portrait, obtainable from Josef Müller, Ars Sacra, Munich. The number of the leaflet is 9040.

The details I have recorded are taken from the January number of a monthly magazine called *Seele*, published by Josef Habbel, Regensburg.

SIMPLICITY IN WORSHIP

Simplicity means absence of complexity. It does not imply bareness or plainness. Simplicity in religion appeals to many Englishmen, perhaps to most Englishmen. It is, in a word, doing only what is necessary, but in the best possible way. It is, however, the fact that

* *Ibid.*, "The Sacraments," vol. vi., p 36.

simplicity in church ceremonial is not usually thought of as an end in itself, but rather as a step towards something more elaborate, and therefore more desirable.

There are several drawbacks to this latter view; one is that where the attempt is being made to improve the ceremonial in a church, the task is made more difficult by the introduction of ceremonies that are not necessary, however laudable or desirable they may be in themselves. Another is that unnecessary differences are introduced between the practice of one church and that of another, and one of our difficulties today is due to these great differences, which often make the occasional attendance at another church than one's own a real embarrassment, and also help to exaggerate the appearance of disunion amongst ourselves. Moreover, while the ceremonial in a church is primarily the concern of the parishioners and the congregation, it is unfortunate that too often a visitor to the church is not merely puzzled but even repelled by what strikes him (perhaps) as being done for the sake of being done, without any obvious reason or meaning—perhaps merely for show.

Why should we not be satisfied in many churches with the service just as it stands, with the accompanying use of the proper vestments and the traditional two altar lights ?

The ideal of simplicity is probably especially needed in respect of music in most churches. There is now a wiser spirit abroad in this matter, but at one time a choral Eucharist meant the introduction of elaborate music only possible for the choir, and the people being deprived of the possibility of singing what they had been accustomed to join in saying. It is now much more common for the Eucharist to be sung to music in which it is possible for the congregation to join. Moreover, it is hard to believe that there is any devotional value in elaborate settings of the Mass indifferently or badly sung.

Too often ceremonies are added to the service simply in accordance with some idea of " correctness " without much consideration of rationality. An instance of this is the singing of the Epistle and Gospel, *when it is not really well done.* This is surely a very irrational proceeding, if the chanting fails in its purpose of making the text audible and intelligible.

Another addition to the service which may apparently feel to be quite indispensable is the singing of the *Benedictus* after the *Sanctus.* I have never been able to understand how this usage came about. We here profess to be joining in the worship of the Holy Trinity by the heavenly host; to append to this the cry of the crowd to our Lord upon earth seems entirely out of place. Is this addition worth while, when it is not to be found in our service book, and simply adds to the number of things which puzzle the unaccustomed worshipper ?

Are we not apt to be too rigid in our ideas—*e.g.*, as to the importance of an elaborate sequence of colours, with the result of having several sets of vestments or hangings of inferior quality, instead of one or two really good ones ? And why should the use of plain white vestments be looked upon merely as a stage towards the use of coloured and elaborate ones ? Would they not be best permanently used in many churches ? They can be very dignified if they are made of the right shape.

To conclude—I am not opposing the use of elaborate or gorgeous ceremonial, which is desirable in the proper place. What I suggest is that in many of our churches it is not the wisest policy to aim at the

maximum of ceremonial which may be found possible or tolerable, in order to reach some supposed standard of correctness, but rather to be content to do in a fitting way what is really necessary.

E. G. P. Wyatt.

THE PARISH COMMUNION

The attractive idea of the Parish Mass, and also the prestige of its primitive nature, is certain to appeal to many, but there are grave dangers attached to it which well merit careful consideration. It is important to note that these dangers have not been mentioned in Father Hebert's recently edited book *The Parish Communion*.

1. There is the danger of making the Mass only and not primarily a service for reception. When the Parish Mass is regarded as a service for the parish as a whole making its Communion, it must needs be that some will approach the altar because it is expected and because they do not wish to be conspicuous by refraining from receiving. Thus "easy" Communions will be encouraged with perilous results to the soul. Nor will there be any other service provided in the morning to which one can come.

2. The High or Sung Mass with no communicants does emphasize the essential sacrificial aspect of the Mass. Though every Mass is an offering of the Holy Sacrifice, such is best understood and appreciated when the congregation is present not to receive but to offer, not to get but to plead. Teaching is urgently required to explain that it is not the *sacerdos* but the *populus* who offer this Sacrifice; Father Dix's brilliant essay in *The Parish Communion* should be read on this point by every priest.

3. The Low Mass definitely is for the communicant a *donum Dei*; it is the coming down of God for the feeding of human souls. Herein the human need receives accentuation, but in the High or Sung Mass without communicants the centre of spiritual gravity has moved from man to God. The idea of getting from God is gone, and instead one gives to God. Worship at its best is pure adoration, and adoration is reverential awe in the holy presence of God; it is not to be equated with thanksgiving, because such implies the idea that something has been given or done, and so the human element again is allowed to intrude. God is not worshipped because of what He has done for us men and for our salvation, but because He is, and because He is—the *Qui est*, which St. Thomas Aquinas considered the only name eminently proper to God—He is worshipful. As Miss Underhill says: "Worship is essentially disinterested" (*Worship*, p. 9). It is obvious that in the non-communicating Mass worship in spirit and in truth has an unrivalled place and genuine expression.

4. In these days when the words "social" and "fellowship" are frequent and used as an antidote to "individualism," it is natural to have pleas for the fellowship of a social Mass, but such pleas are loosely expressed. Sometimes they refer to the state of the worshippers in the Mass, and at other times after the Mass at the Parish Breakfast. But what is this fellowship? Is it merely knowing one's fellow-worshippers and being friendly with them because all are united in the common act of Communion? There is a danger that such an idea will spread, but

the real fellowship of the Mass is not merely a fellowship with fellow-Christians in the same church. It is a mystical communion with the whole *corpus* of the Church, no more the *Ecclesia Militans* than the *Ecclesia Pascens* and the *Ecclesia Triumphans*. To stress the local fellowship in a particular church is to forfeit the proper perspective of the one Church's association with every Mass. Admitted that there is a spiritual relationship and fellowship between the occupants of the same pew, but it need be no more than that between the worshipper and the whole company of heaven. The modern plea for fellowship in the Mass dangerously emphasizes the local church, and encourages a geocentric point of view which diminishes the complete significance and extent of the Mass. The same danger is seen in the Parish Breakfast, which is the feast of the local fellowship. In town and city parishes this breakfast is quite unnecessary. The communicant makes his Communion in the church nearest to his home, even though he is a member of another church. Many would find that it was of greater spiritual help, and no denial of the mystical fellowship, to return quietly from receiving the Holy Food than to resort to a hall, where one may have danced and played whist, to talk and devour eggs. The real after-Mass mood is not friendship in the parish hall, but that expressed by Anna Bunston in her poem "A Basque Peasant returning from Church" (*vide The Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse*).

5. In this artisan parish, characteristic of many, it would be impossible and inadvisable to have only a Parish Mass at or about 9 a.m. At 11 the people are able to come to a Sung or High Mass, and some will have made their Communion at 8 that morning. Others will have come the day before at 9 a.m. to a Mass sung by the children's choir, which is specially for those, chiefly mothers and some living outside the parish but liking to make their Communion in their own church, who find 8 a.m. on Sunday inconvenient for a rather personal and obvious reason. This Saturday Mass meets a real need, and a cup of tea can be provided for those who do not live in the immediate vicinity, but this is no Parish Breakfast, and talk is discouraged. For those who find both Saturday and Sunday impossible, there is a Mass on Monday at 9 a.m. which the mothers attend after having escorted or seen their children to school.

PATRICK COWLEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

SUNDAY MORNING WORSHIP

SIR,

You ask: "Is it right to have at the principal Communion of Sunday no communicants?"

I often discussed this question with Canon Stuckey Coles, who came in his later years to be quite sure that a sung Mass at eleven normally without communicants was the best service for an average village parish. He had been much impressed by the opinion of Dr. Robert Wilson, Warden of Keble, who said to him that this arrangement was "inevitable."

So long as we keep in our rite the "Communion devotions"—which, like very many post-communions in the Roman Missal, assume that

the congregation communicates—so long it will be plain that the complete and ideal Mass is a Mass at which this is in fact the case. But the circumstances of modern life often make this impossible in practice. This is recognized everywhere in the Church. No doubt there are many parishes in which the new plan of a sung Mass with many communicants and a breakfast afterwards may be a great success. I think, however, that such parishes will be those in rather special circumstances, where the priest has not to aim at the presence of the gentry and farmers and labourers all at the same service. There has lately been living here a man who as a lad used to attend with much edification the Sunday Communion and breakfast at Temple Balsall, but there the large group of almshouses, the hall, and the character of the population made the circumstances quite unlike those of a normal, old-fashioned village with strong traditions of religious practice.

Since we have no general custom of frequent confession there is a very real risk in the encouragement of all our people to Communion every Sunday, and the social aspect of the Eucharist seems sometimes to be emphasized to excess, as Miss Underhill suggests (*Worship*, pp. 159, 160).

J. F. Briscoe.

Bagborough,
July 10, 1937.

THE TRAINING OF THE INDIAN MINISTRY

To the Editor of Theology

Dear Sir,

Mr. Hollis's article on the "Training of the Indian Ministry," in the current number of Theology, is an excellent survey of the problem it deals with.

There are, however, two points that may be explained for those who do not know the position.

He knows more of South India than the North, and he omits to say that the Oxford Mission to Calcutta have in the last year established a small theological school at Barisal, under a Bengali Christian priest, to train Bengali and Garo priests. It is only in its infancy, but it has great possibilities.

The language difficulty is acute in the North—*e.g.*, the small diocese of Assam uses at least four languages in its services, the diocese of Calcutta four, and Chota Nagpur three or four—and this reacts on the training of the clergy. I have always gathered that the language areas in South India are larger, though I personally have no experience of the South.

He does not explain what the Serampore B.D. is, and perhaps few readers of the article know. Carey founded a Baptist college at Serampore in Bengal, and in 1828 the King of Denmark—Serampore is a Danish settlement—founded a college to confer degrees in Arts and Divinity. The Arts degree is in abeyance on affiliation to Calcutta University, but the Divinity degree is given by examination, and any college can affiliate for it.

The college does give a standard theological examination, that enables the better scholar to specialize, but it has the weakness of tending to fix men's thought on the literary side during their preparation for Orders.

The best course is to make it a sort of "Staff College" course—*i.e.*, after ordination—which Bishop's College, Calcutta, is now doing, and thus provide the Indian Church with a reserve of men who have had a more advanced theological course and can train others.

I should perhaps say that the examiners of the Serampore B.D. are not confined to any one theological body.

The building-up of the Indian Church makes the sending of well-trained theologians to India of greater importance than in past years.

I was talking some years ago to an Indian nationalist, who was the head of an Indian college, and he said: "The great disaster is the Indianizing of the one service that should not be Indianized—the educational."

His point was that men trained by Englishmen, as he had been, were better fitted to lead Indians than men who were not. It is a personal expression of opinion, and might not be universally endorsed, though I agree. This is equally true in the sphere of the Indian Church, and a wide opportunity of usefulness is open to those who have the requisite qualifications for teaching and training the future leaders of Indian congregations and dioceses.

Yours faithfully,

H. Fulford Williams

(*Chaplain India Ecclesiastical Service*, 1912-16, *Examiner Serampore*, 1915-34).

REVIEW

History of Christian Thought. Edited by E. G. Selwyn, D.D. The Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d.

"In the controversy between the Theists and Deists, the finest intellects were ranged on the side of Theism." This is the verdict of Professor G. Dawes Hicks, whose Hibbert Lectures on *The Philosophical Bases of Theism* have just been published. And what so acute a critic of philosophy says regarding the Christian thinkers of the eighteenth century, any equally unbiassed philosopher would say regarding the Christian thinkers of any of the decisive eras in the history of Christian Thought. Christian Thought has won in every conflict, not because it had religious sanction and authority, but because it was the best and truest thought. "This anvil has already worn out many hammers." It was Calvin who said that.

At the outset Christian Thought had none of the advantages of tradition and general acceptance. For that reason the study of Christian Thought in its early stages is of the utmost importance. The first chapter in this book, entitled "Hellenism, Judaism and Christianity," written by the Rev. Gregory Dix, is so good that it is difficult to conceive of the subject being better treated in so short a space. "Could Christianity become the religion of the Hellenistic world without hopeless distortion?" That was the crucial question, and the answer is Yes, "because it declined to formulate itself in terms of a passing period, and insisted on retaining its own." And its own terms were uniquely and distinctively Judaic.

St. Augustine and his period form the next study, and in the very brief space allowed him (much too brief) the Rev. F. C. Tindall states clearly the contribution of the great Bishop of Hippo in his defence of the Faith against the three prevalent heresies. There is no pretence in this book that the individual Christian thinkers were invariably right on all points. Mr. Tindall roundly condemns St. Augustine's teaching on original guilt as "unscriptural and horrible." Mr. Blakeney supplies an historical and biographical framework for the thought contributed by St. Augustine.

The chapter on Scholasticism by Professor A. A. Cock is a masterpiece of condensed and lucid exposition. Fortunately he finds space to refer to the Arabian influence which recent investigation has found to have been so potent for a spell. Averroes produced a Mohammedan Scholasticism and (although

it is not mentioned here) Maimonides produced a Jewish Scholasticism, but only the Christian Scholasticism survived.

The summary of the teaching of Aquinas seems to include every side of his many-sided thought. In logic he has no equal, understanding by logic, deductive reasoning; but "Duns Scotus is a better psychologist than St. Thomas," thinks Professor Cock, and notices, suggestively, the affinity between Duns and a much later Scot, Balfour. It is a pity that the one sentence in reference to Ockham, "his insistence that the individual is the real," could not have been expanded, especially since there is nearly a page left empty.

The study of Luther by Professor Hermann Sasse is sympathetic, penetrating and highly illuminating. "Luther was never a modern." It is true that he rejected mediæval theology, but he did not reject the mediæval Church. He saw, however, that the test of Catholicity is not universality but apostolicity. He turns, therefore, to the Scriptures, but "in the Scriptures Luther found the God of jealousy and wrath who imposes upon man tasks that he cannot fulfil and condemns him to judgment and death because he does not fulfil them." Small wonder that "he often wished that God did not exist." But, in due time, his very despair became the clue to his only hope. We are helpless sinners, but "God calls the sinners righteous, and only sinners." This is "the miracle of mercy, so offensive to our rational system of morality." One is tempted to say that Luther is strongly Barthian in his theology.

The Counter-Reformation is dealt with by the Rev. G. W. O. Addleshaw, who fixes upon the one point that these "thinkers set about rebuilding Christian morality by the study of prayer." The Rev. H. Balmforth writes briefly on the Developments of the Reformation in England, and gives a prominent place to Hooker because "he brought back the Natural Law as a reasonable ground for Christian Thought and action."

The Editor magnanimously reserves for himself the most difficult task of all, the Modern Age, 1700-1930, which has to be treated in twenty pages. He gives ample consideration to Maurice, and finds that it is possible to relate many of the other thinkers to his movement. This is a courageous and ingenious device, and proves to be a successful way of accomplishing an almost impossible task.

Every reader will probably ask why this or that name was not included—why, for instance, there is a reference to Malebranche but none to Leibniz, whose *Theodicy* is well worth consideration; and to Locke but not to Berkeley, who did so much to re-establish the belief in a Christian God. Dr. Selwyn,

however, forestalls such criticism in his Introduction, where he lays down the rigid criteria of Christian Thought, and where he admits that "the difficulty has been to know what to omit."

The task imposed upon himself by the Editor and by him upon the contributors has been admirably well fulfilled. It would have been an easier task, however, if, instead of attempting in so short a space a History of Christian Thought, the writers had been content to offer "Some Types of Christian Thought." In some sections this is what the particular writer has done, and in these sections the book is at its best.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

NOTICES

THE PROPHETS AND THE RISE OF JUDAISM. By Adolphe Lods. Kegan Paul. 25s.

In this book Professor Lods continues to trace the history and religion of Israel from the point reached in his *Israel from its Beginning to the Middle of the Eighth Century* down to the dawn of the Maccabean period. On most of the literary questions reopened in recent years he defends the previous "assured results," rejecting, *e.g.*, theories that would put Deuteronomy much earlier, or later, than the seventh century, or assign to the Book of Ezekiel a Palestinian origin, though he is inclined to think that "Deutero-Isaiah" lived either in Phœnicia or in Palestine (p. 241). His main theme is that Yahwism became Judaism through a compromise between the prophetic and popular ideas of religion, and that Judaism killed prophecy by assigning first place to a written Torah. It is essential to his theory to maintain that the eighth and seventh-century prophets were all hostile to the sacrificial cultus in principle, and he asserts this on pp. 68 *f.* Yet later he uses Isa. vi. to prove that Isaiah did not object to the cultus in principle, and says that "with Isaiah the great prophets are moving in the direction of a compromise with traditional religion" (p. 111), though oddly he omits all mention of Isa. i. 10 *ff.* In some other respects Professor Lods seems an unreliable guide. On pp. 69 *f.*, *e.g.*, he suggests that the roots of Messianic prophecy are to be found in Egypt, basing this opinion on but slender evidence, and holds that it had established itself in Israel before the eighth century, yet on p. 111 he regards it as very doubtful whether the Messianic passages in Isaiah are authentic. Again, on p. 116 he remarks that in the account of Josiah's reform we are not told that Manasseh had rebuilt the shrines destroyed by Hezekiah, overlooking 2 Kings xxi. 3. He says that the use of incense was "attacked for the first time by Jeremiah" (p. 123), forgetting Isa. i. 13; while on p. 284 he represents P to be in contradiction with J and E as regards the origin of circumcision, taking Exod. iv. 24-26 as J's account of its origin and Josh. v. 2-3, 8-9 as E's account, though neither passage professes to give the *origin* of circumcision and the latter expressly says otherwise. These, however, are minor blemishes on a notable and useful book. More serious are the numerous misprints. I have noted the following: on p. 13, "contains" for "contained"; Merodach-baladan on p. 29 is Marduk-aplu-iddina, on p. 31 Marduk-apluiddin, and on p. 105 Marduk-paliddin; "expiration" on p. 101 for "expiation"; "Isaiah" for "Hezekiah" on p. 115, line 9 from bottom; on p. 123 the date 681-688 for 681-668; on p. 8 the Book of Zephaniah is dated 626-621, and on p. 131 between 640 and 662; on p. 268, "the spring of 520" should be 522; and on p. 319 the date 590 for Jesus ben Sirach is a misprint for 190. Some Biblical citations also need correction: on p. 135 Exod. xx. 22-3, 19 should be Exod. xx. 22–xxiii. 19; on p. 147, n. 9, cci. 23, 10-15 should be xx. 10-15; on p. 209 Isa lxiii. 7-64, 12 should be Isa. lxiii. 7–lxiv. 12; and on p. 249, n., Isa. xlii. 81-20 should be Isa. xlii. 18-20.

A. E. MORRIS.

PASTORALIA

1. Master Builders. By Canon A. E. Simpson. Mowbray. 2s.
2. The Family of Christ's Church. By John Darlington. Mowbray. 1s. 6d.
3. Mackay of All Saints'. By Sidney Dark. Centenary Press. 6s.
4. Haggerston Year. By H. A. Wilson. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.
5. Background of Spiritual Healing. By A. Graham Ikin. Allen and Unwin. 6s.
6. Introduction to Pastoral Theology. By Henry Balmforth, Lindsay Dewar, Cyril E. Hudson, Edmund W. Sara. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.
7. Approach to Marriage. By G. D. Rosenthal. Mothers' Union. 2s. 6d.

The first two books on this list might well be read together, since each in its own way implies a criticism of the individualism that stultifies some aspects of parish life. Each author has found a formula and works out its consequences for the modern parish. For Mr. Darlington, with his experience of the new housing areas, it is the thought of the parish as a family; for Canon Simpson it is " the building up of the Body of Christ " in the parish as the objective of pastoral work. If neither book contains much that is new, each justifies itself by its realism and faith.

The next two books also pair in a certain sense. Fr. Mackay and Fr. Wilson were, in their different capacities, driving forces of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses. Both books tell the story of a priest at work, and both are written with distinction. Mr. Dark, having to tell the story of a man great in many ways, clearly determined to give a picture that would do justice to the limitations as well as the brilliant gifts of his friend. So, with the insight of a brother-artist, he has appraised one whom he rightly describes as combining " the artist with the teacher of the Gospel." Mackay's many friends, it may be supposed, will find here the portrait which they would have wished to be preserved, and those to whom he was only a great name will understand better why he meant so much to the Church in London and beyond, and why (perhaps it may be added) he did not mean even more. To describe Fr. Wilson's delightful book as an autobiography may seem unkind, for the last person about whom the author of *Haggerston Year* really wants to write is Fr. Wilson. None the less it is a bit of delightful and unconscious autobiography, a parish priest's account of the parish that he loves, and autobiographical because a parish priest is telling the story of his people and their church. We can all of us, young and old, learn something from Haggerston.

Miss Graham Ikin holds an interesting and important post. As a psychologist, working under the Archbishop of York's committee of doctors and clergy, she acts as a link between those working at the physical, mental and spiritual symptoms and causes of disease. The present book maps out the subject and contains valuable chapters on the Instincts, Moral Disease, Suggestion and Faith, Psycho-analysis and Confession.

The literature of Pastoralia is really surprisingly small. Here is a subject that occupies the lives of many thousands of men, and yet the serious attempts to add to our knowledge are few. This Introduction to Pastoral Theology deserves the warmest welcome and commendation.

Two of the authors, as a previous book showed, have seen very clearly that pastoral work must alter its shape as the findings of the science of psychology are applied to it. Such an alteration must eventually look like a revolution, and they are wise enough to know that ecclesiastical revolutions are not made overnight. Canon Hudson and Canon Dewar have therefore carried their previous work a stage further, with the help of Mr. Balmforth and the new Assistant Bishop of Jamaica. They now provide what is in fact a textbook on individual work which ought to be commended to the clergy, young and old, for serious study.

Whether the Christian Ideal, which the authors describe in terms of Holiness, can actually be described by such a single term is at least disputable, even though the authors shew that they mean by Holiness an active as well as a passive virtue. This section, which contains an admirable chapter on Sin and Forgiveness, is followed by an extended treatment of the priest's ministry to the individual, which is really the heart of the book. There is a careful description of the priest's personal preparation and training for individual work which leads on to much sensible guidance about the hearing of confessions. Here the authors are indebted to the classical moral and ascetic theology, to which they readily acknowledge their debt; but the approach is modern in the sense that it is informed by the sympathy and understanding that the new psychology brings to dealings with individuals. The chapter on the pastoral care of children, which concludes this section, is not on quite the same level of competence. Some wise and necessary things are noted, but the subject is too big for adequate treatment in a book of this scope, and it is to be hoped that the authors may one day find themselves able to supplement the present chapter by a further study on what our present knowledge of the human soul has to tell us about the priest's care of his children.

The final section deals with the work of a priest as a spiritual physician to special cases, where there are morbid conditions. How far the duties of the priesthood include the art of the psycho-analyst is so far a matter for debate. What is beyond dispute is the need that those who deal with souls should at least know the field of morbid psychology in outline, and this the authors have provided for admirably.

The last book on this list, Dr. Rosenthal's, also breaks new ground, and does it with distinction. In recent years publishers, whose primary interest was presumably not religious, have given the public books that contained expositions of the emotional and physical side of marriage. They have attracted their legions of readers because they were alone in the field and the Church seemed to have nothing to say on their own ground, and also because their books were written with imagination and sympathy. It was time that the Church should offer realistic guidance in a different key and with a different ethic, and this need Dr. Rosenthal has met with a book which will help those who are near marriage to understand not only its physical and emotional sides, but also its sacramental implications. Those who dislike realism will possibly regret its realism here and there; but it is doubtful whether a book that shirks description of the realities will ever seem to its younger readers sufficiently honest to be accepted as a guide in spiritual things. Many clergy, and many parents of children approaching marriage, will find here just the guidance which they desire their young people to have, when the time for marriage draws near.

J. R. Lumb.

BOOK NOTES

Why the Cross? By H. E. Gillebaud. Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, London. 2s. 6d. This little book contains the fruits of a number of discussions on the doctrine of the Atonement, and some of the problems that are connected therewith. The theology is a little crude, but the author produces evidence to prove that his doctrine has an effective evangelistic appeal.

The Divine Concern. By Lilian Guise. James Clark and Co. 2s. 6d. This little volume attempts in brief compass to set forward what the author calls an "outline of Christian Mystical Theology." It is not a book which calls for much comment, as the treatment is slight and the theology not very convincing.

Christ and Prayer. By C. F. Andrews. Student Christian Movement Press. 2s. 6d. The author of this book is known in many lands as a spiritual teacher. In this present volume he comments upon the teaching of our Lord about prayer as recorded in the Gospels. To this he has added some notes on the practice of prayer and the devotional reading of the Bible, which were drawn up for a series of University lectures in Cambridge last year. It will suffice to say that the book is thoughtful in its teaching and reverent in its tone.

The Magnet of the Heart. By Robert Menzies. James Clark and Co. 3s. 6d. This book contains a number of evangelical addresses in which the author aims at evoking personal allegiance to our Lord. They have been delivered in the course of evangelistic campaigns in different parts of the country. They are certainly arresting in their presentation of the Gospel truths, and convincing to the heart if not always to the mind. The author is a minister in the Church of Scotland.

H. L. H.

Handbuch zum Neuen Testament: Thessalonicher-Philipper. By M. Dibelius. M. 4.20. *Markus-Evangelium.* By E. Klostermann, M.6. J. C. B. Mohr. Tübingen. Lietzmann's *Handbuch* is in many ways the ideal New Testament Commentary. Questions of introduction, historicity, etc., are for the most part left to other books, the authors confining themselves to commentary proper. Even with the adverse exchange the books are very cheap. Being revised every few years, they are always up to date. References to ancient authors are printed in full, if they are important. The two latest revisions partake of all the wonted excellences of the series.

Confirmed in this Faith. By Ronald Sinclair. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. A useful manual for secondary school children, by a priest who has made a special feature of "pilots," young people confirmed in former years who help the new candidates.

The Holy Trinity. By J. P. Arendzen. Sheed and Ward. 5s. This is described in the sub-title as "a theological treatise for modern laymen." It is excellently suited for such laymen as already accept the doctrine of the authority of the Church. But probably most Anglican laymen who want to read about such things need a book which goes more deeply into the antecedents of modern theological and philosophical thinking.

W. K. L. C.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher